



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Lubin, David.

381.3
L929

A novel proposition.

381.3 L929

381.3 L929

13
29



LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

A NOVEL PROPOSITION.

No. 1

EVOLUTIONIZING THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEAR
FARM PRODUCTS MOVED AS MAIL MATTER AT
A UNIFORM RATE FOR ALL DISTANCES.

OF INTEREST ALIKE TO AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURE,
COMMERCE AND LABOR.

BY DAVID LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.

*Containing Editorial Opinions and Comments from Every
Section of the Union.*

SACRAMENTO:
D. JOHNSTON & Co., PRINTERS.
1893.

LOCAL JEALOUSY.

Quite a number of otherwise clear-headed people are afflicted with the distemper of sectional jealousy.

This trait often leads to narrowness of views, and hasty condemnation of worthy propositions, which are calculated to be for their best interests, but which in their haste they reject because they cannot immediately discover how their own section is to be especially benefited.

A review of this pamphlet will convince the reader that my observations on sectional jealousy are based on facts. A Middle State man, for instance, objects to a proposition that will enable California to transport her wheat crop at a much lower rate than the present system will permit, believing in the theory that anything which will benefit California must prove injurious to his section. He has not taken the trouble to think out the problem in all its bearings. It is sufficient for him to conclude that whatever California may gain, his section must lose. If you ask him for a reason, he will flare up and give none, but yell at you that he knows what he is talking about. But he does not. He is simply blinded for the time by local jealousy.

It is to this class of men that I address myself in this article, in the hope that I may convince them that a general benefit for the entire country must also benefit all sections and the individuals therein. To prove that this is correct, let us take the transportation of California wheat, and note the influence transportation methods in this state has on the price of wheat in all sections of the union. To begin with, the buyer for export takes as a basis the price at Liverpool, from which he deducts the cost of transportation, and he finds the price which he is willing to offer. The higher transportation costs, the lower price will he offer. And if he buys at all he will buy at the price thus arrived at; never higher, but lower if possible. As soon as he can buy at the price thus fixed, then this also becomes the price at which wheat can be bought for home use, and governs the rate at which wheat is sold, not alone in California, but wherever wheat is raised in the United States. Thus, a high price for wheat transportation in California, will lower the selling price throughout the United States. Any student of political economy will tell you this is correct. Yes, any wheat "operator" can tell you the same thing.

As soon as this is granted, we must conclude that the Postal System herein advocated will not alone prove beneficial to California, but prove to be an equal benefit to every section of the union, and that, not alone to the wheat grower, but to the store-keeper, the manufacturer, and more especially to the workingman. And when these are benefited, all others whatsoever within the United States will share in this general prosperity. Local jealousy is, therefore, anti-progressive.

FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND.

The original order for these pamphlets to the printer was 20,000. This was increased by 15,000 more; but, the demand justifying, an additional 20,000 has been printed, and the pages ordered electrotyped for further needs. This being the case, the conclusion has been reached not to print a new edition for next month, believing it best to keep on supplying the calls for this issue until the demand slackens. The next issue will contain opinions and comments for which there is no space in this. Anyone desiring copies of the present or of the next issue will please send names and addresses.

255595

A NOVEL PROPOSITION.

Revolutionizing the Distribution of Wealth.—Farm Products Moved as Mail Matter at a Uniform Rate for All Distances.

By DAVID LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA.

[Reprinted from the Sacramento "Record-Union" of Sept. 14th. 1893.]



DESIGN or fortuity has conserved the results of intellectual endeavor from times past to the present, and this alone has rendered development possible.

There is perhaps no other political power on the globe whose tendency it has been to utilize the advantages of this conservation in its growth and development to a greater degree than this nation.

As a result, the high ambition, exalted achievements, and future tendency of the American people point to a destiny singularly grand and without parallel among the nations.

This grand destiny, however, is threatened by a phase deteriorating in its influence, and has its root in the established order of lower civilizations of other nations.

Chief among these may be noted the unjust and unequaled distribution of wealth, resulting in extremes of superfluous superabundance and abject poverty, resulting in centralized despotisms.

Were it possible for this nation to escape the deteriorating influences exerted by foreign forms of government, then, in that event, the several progressive stages would be passed through, ultimately producing a maximum state of civilization, which, when once reached, would become the guiding center for all nations.

The deteriorating influences above mentioned are, however, at work, which, if not checked, must ultimately neutralize and change the current of events detrimental to a realization of ideal progress.

Material prosperity is an essential element of true progress, and agriculture is the basic foundation of lasting material prosperity.

Any cause detrimental to the realization of the maximum benefits to be derived from agriculture is a check to general and lasting development, and unless removed the deteriorating force will persist in its operation in a line of degeneration.

Those, therefore, who seek to promote the best interests of agriculture, desire to conserve the highest interests of the nation and of the individuals therein.

Chief among the deteriorating forces tending toward a degrading level in agriculture is that of foreign competition, and this competition is caused by the class of labor employed and the compensation paid therefor in Europe, and more especially in Asia and Africa.

At a time when the production of our country did not warrant our seeking a foreign market this competition was not felt to the degree that it is now. The vastly increased volume of production made it necessary for producers to seek a foreign market. The price being governed by the demand and cost of production, our producers are compelled to meet on an equal footing with the producers employing the European peasants, the fellah and fellahen of Egypt, the moujik of Russia, and the Indian and Chinese coolie.

When we consider that the peasant and the

moujik are content with ten to twenty cents a day and the fellah and coolie with from four to ten cents a day for field labor, what wonder then that our producers are gradually but surely driven to the extremity of mortgages and ruin, and that in spite of the fact that they habitually toil a greater number of hours, live in the greatest simplicity, and as a general rule pay their labor a lesser compensation than those in other occupations?

The question is often asked, "Why do farmers forsake their farms, and why do they and their sons flock to the city?"

Those who ask these questions generally answer them themselves, and as a rule berate the farmer and his sons for their supposed disregard for the beauties of nature.

Upon proper inquiry these questioners would learn that the reason why farmers and their sons flock to the city is because farming, as a general rule, is an unprofitable occupation, and that there is no prospect for its becoming profitable and remaining so.

That as soon as farming could be made profitable the farmer and his son would not alone cheerfully remain on the farm, but that very many city people would flock to the farm and stay there.

The question of competition with coolie and fellah labor is not the only one confronting the producer; the question of transportation is equally important.

It is complained that the arbitrary and often exorbitant rates of transportation have been the fruitful source of many grievous hindrances toward progress, but greater than all these is the singular phase of distance competition.

To illustrate: A manufactured article made in Jersey City to be sold there for thirty-five dollars, when sent to Chicago, has say two dollars added, and in San Francisco say five dollars added for cost of freight (which the consumer pays for, with an additional profit added on the outlay of the freight by the merchant), but of two producers, one living within ten miles of the market and another living three hundred or three thousand miles from the market, the product of both (if the same) will bring the same price in spite of the fact that the cost of transportation was for the former five dollars and for the other fifty dollars.

We may say to this that the distance from market governs the price of land. As the conditions are now this is true, but the question remains—is it right?

Merchants, as a rule, deal in merchandise, the value of which is unknown, and can, therefore, fix any arbitrary price thereon to suit their convenience and their ideas of profit. Now, even under these favorable circumstances, would they be willing to sell a piano, a plow, a hat, or an ostrich feather at the same price in the city of its production and at a distance of hundreds or thousands of miles? No, indeed; the freight and the profit on the freight would be added to the selling price.

Now, what a merchant is not willing to do with a

article, the selling price of which is an unknown quantity to the public, the farmer is compelled to do with products so staple that he is in luck if he receives but the price quoted in a thousand price currents.

The fact that land near a market is more valuable than land a great distance from it has not nearly as much to do with the true prosperity of the nation as if the land near and far were of equal value. In other words, the citizen living near New York is not of any more value to the republic than is one of California or Kansas, and when conditions confer a benefit on the citizen near New York at the expense of a citizen of Ohio or California it is a wrong, and this wrong, if permitted to continue, must in time produce evil effects. This wrong is nowhere more manifest than in the United States, for no other country has such vast distances to traverse before reaching its ultimate market.

To simply point out the difficulties under which agriculture labors, and that alone, is not my sole object, for this has been done often, and by abler minds. What I propose to do is to offer a remedy, as follows:

To meet the competitive coolie and peasant labor I would recommend national legislation to the effect that all lands owned and worked by American citizens, or those intending to become such, shall not be subject to any governmental tax of any kind. Rented lands, lands owned by aliens, or lands not under cultivation shall, however, be taxed as now.

To meet the transportation question, I would suggest national legislation that would change our present method of product transportation to the same system as now in operation by the United States postoffice in the forwarding of mail matter, and in charge of that department.

To illustrate: A fruit-grower at San Rafael wishes to send five hundred pounds of peaches to San Francisco. He obtains a stamp at his postoffice (which may be say three times the size of a postal card, and on pasteboard); he attaches same to one of his crates and delivers same to the postal clerk at railroad company's depot. Say the value of the stamp is one dollar. Another grower in Chico also wishes to send a like quantity of peaches to the same destination, and he too obtains a one dollar stamp, and the fruit is forwarded the same way. A third grower in Sacramento county wishes to forward a like quantity to New York, and he likewise obtains a one dollar stamp and the fruit goes on to New York.

In short, land products in their natural state are to be forwarded in any quantity to any destination just the same as other mail matter and subject to similar conditions.

When it is considered that paper-covered books and other "literature" is sent by the publisher to any part of the United States in any quantity at one cent per pound, or one dollar per hundred, and that this "literature" is forwarded on fast trains, then, in that event, the proposition here offered is only new to the extent that farm products take an equal rank with literature.

The two remedies proposed at first glance may seem to many as highly impracticable, and even absurd, but all that is asked here is a little patience and careful attention, and the probabilities are that a sufficient element of agreement may be found that may lead to ultimate concurrence, and if not in the plan herein proposed in some other more available.

That agriculture is the very corner-stone of our national prosperity is beyond a question a fact. That it should receive prime consideration in legislative action conducive to its successful prosecution is apparent, but in reality we find other and less important interests much more carefully fostered. Manufacture, for instance, is maintained by a protective tariff, and that not alone against the coolie labor of China or India, but even of the higher labor of Great Britain, France and Germany.

I will now proceed to submit some of the objections offered against these propositions: The first is

that it is a species of socialism. Reply: Protection against Indian and Chinese coolie labor is a species of socialism, then is protection against British, and French labor a greater degree of socialism? Conclusion: If one is bad, the other is worse; not all admit that the success of all other industries whatever are dependent upon the success of agriculture?

Commerce, industry, finance, the arts, the sciences and science, all these are firmly seated on the broad shoulders of agriculture. This giant carries the tremendous burden. "The straw broke the camel's back," and as this giant is human it behooves that care be taken that he be not overloaded, for his strength is the strength of the nation, and his decline is the decline of the interests of civilization. When he staggers, less numbers congest in city tenements, and he groans the threatening form of the proletariat with his detested bloody ensign and his dynamite bomb, appears in view, and with God-curse law-despising harangue urges on to blood. In vain the Gatling gun, in vain the bayonet shall be thrust aside like a reed in the hand of the child, just as soon as our overburdened strength gives way. Remove his burdens, the beneficent rays of prosperity will enbeam, and then thousands and hundreds of millions, yes, millions, will crawl out of their holes and eagerly seek a home in the country. Praise God when they have found it, and then man shall sit under his own vine and his own fig tree, and there shall no one make him afraid."

To return to our proposition, the free practically free freight. Will this not rest vast sum? Will it not foot up into hundreds of millions of dollars? Yes, it is the removal of a vast sum, these hundreds of millions of dollars from the shoulders of this patient, overburdened man that shall give him new vigor, greater energy, and a lasting foundation. Upon whom then shall the burden of these millions? Upon all who are farmers.

Will they not object? Yes, some, until I have been convinced that it is in their interest to object. Some will object through selfishness, others through misunderstanding.

Would it be just to take from the burden of agriculture, and place it on the others? If it is unjust to agriculture, then it is even more unjust to manufacture. We protect American cutlery against English cutlery, American cloaks against English cloaks. Then why not American agriculture against the peasant and coolie labor of Asia and Africa?

Suppose the present administration should remove the tariff from shoes and manufactured cotton goods, would follow? What but in less than a year thousands of factories would be in operation making shoes, overalls, underwear, hosiery, spreads would come from there, and at a much lower price than we ever have had them? What dismay would be heard from the hundreds of thousands of idle operatives thrown out of work here, and of ruined manufacturers with "plants" on their hands.

Now, when we consider that these same operatives and their employers are all dependent upon and profit upon the success of agriculture, a wonder that they alone are protected, and agriculture alone is left to the tender mercies of a nation which governs the price of their product, the price of a similar product produced by the coolie labor, at from four to ten cents a day?

It may be asked how it came about that the manufacturer managed to so thoroughly protect his interests, while the farmer was practically left on his own hook. The reason may be fourfold: greater shrewdness of the manufacturer, greater ability to avail of political means, greater concentration, as the manufacturer has great centers, they could in a few hours; for mutual assistance. Representing, as the millions of capital, their resolutions carry an irresistible influence in legislation. The

of employes could also present that ment in the form of a united organization, ly advocating the interests of their emd this political influence became irrend their cry of "protection" became law. mer had no such advantages; in fact, he ot them yet, and may never have them; had a "cry" at all it was "Free Trade," is he was peculiarly unfortunate, for it pular, and there is nothing more calcu- nure a political faction than an unpopu- The farmer wasted his strength in frantic efforts at ameliorating his condition, and is far off from his goal as ever. In sheer e affiliates with all sorts of political scum, n hope that relief may come from some- mehew, a pitiable spectacle to God and l climaxed when the political pirate on ls him "nature's nobleman," and behind "clod-hopper" and "Jay." t ever be, if the conditions permit it. Shall in? God forbid. Will the merchant agree to it? Yes; for the additional tax to him by this method will enhance your value as a customer. Will the manufacturer agree to it? Yes; and for the same reason as the merchant. Will the man of bonds and mortgages agree to it? Yes, when it can be demonstrated that his bonds and mortgages will then possess a greater degree of security. To be sure, there may be many rabid objectors nevertheless, but what will these avail if the majority should favor? How may this be accomplished? Three words may suffice for the initial stage. Agitate, educate and organize, and when all this has been done endeavor to win the indorsement and co-operation of the two great political parties, and if you fail, form a national party of your own.

method of protection, while it protects the manufacturer, does not and cannot protect you; for, while the ultimate customer of the manufacturer is the American citizen, yours is the European Exchange; that while the manufacturer fixes any price on his product that may suit his whim or convenience, that your prices are determined by the coolie labor of Asia and the peasant of Europe, and that you seek protection against these.

Any system of protective tariff cannot overcome that; that the only remedy for relief must be in the nature of an internal rebate system on taxes and transportation. The millions rebated will counteract the evil effects of coolie and peasant labor, as no other method can. It is the only real kind of protection possible for the condition. Will the workman consent to be taxed with the additional tax from which you expect to be freed? Yes, assuredly he will, as soon as you demonstrate that by his doing so it will secure him a greater possibility of a steady demand for labor than is now possible.

Will the merchant agree to it? Yes; for the additional tax to him by this method will enhance your value as a customer.

Will the manufacturer agree to it? Yes; and for the same reason as the merchant. Will the man of bonds and mortgages agree to it? Yes, when it can be demonstrated that his bonds and mortgages will then possess a greater degree of security.

To be sure, there may be many rabid objectors nevertheless, but what will these avail if the majority should favor?

How may this be accomplished? Three words may suffice for the initial stage. Agitate, educate and organize, and when all this has been done endeavor to win the indorsement and co-operation of the two great political parties, and if you fail, form a national party of your own.

INTRODUCTORY.

it proper to briefly explain the reason obligation. The past twenty years has ason of active commercial and agricul- eriences with me, and the problems of ation have ever been uppermost in my

opposition I advocate is not the result and book learning alone, but this to- th experience and observation.

nature deliberation, I have come to lusion that my plan offers a remedy xisting under present conditions, and lightened intelligence should reform. ng as I do that my conclusions— ey be adopted—would be of benefit to and to my country, I deem it my duty hem known, and to this end publish

these pamphlets for distribution ut the Union.

his because my first article in the ion of September 14th, created that ad and deep interest justifying the g of the field of information.

ient interest is taken in the matter, r will be encouraged to continue writ- he same subject, with the ultimate it may become a national issue. And that he may ascertain the extent of

the interest taken, he has left a space below to serve as a kind of ballot, to be filled in and sent to him at the earliest date possible. In addition to forwarding the ballots, the writer would be pleased to have full opinions in writing for or against the proposition.

All communications on this subject, in order to receive attention, should be addressed to D. LUBIN (care Weinstock, Lubin & Co.), Sacramento, Cal. Communications will be answered as promptly as the time of the writer will permit.

Those desiring extra copies, for distribution among friends at home or abroad, will be accommodated by sending in names and address, and the number of copies desired.

The writer suggests that portions of the new proposition be read at Grange and Alliance meetings, social assemblages, and especially at Labor Unions, and in family and neighborhood gatherings.

While, from the title of the proposition, it would seem that it addresses itself to the interests of farmers only, yet a glance at one or two of the articles will convince the reader that it is intended to be of interest to every one, especially to those who love their country.

Parents can do a great service to their chil-

dren by reading to them the various articles, and, after explanations, asking for opinions. By so doing, they may thereby implant a taste for further inquiry in the direction of political economy, a study which, in time, might prove serviceable indeed.

Should a sufficient interest be manifest in any community on the subject, then there is no reason why an association may not be formed to further the object in view, and for uniformity's sake the writer has adopted for the present as the title for such organization, "The National Progress Association of ———." The name of "Tax and Transit Association" has also been suggested as appropriate. Readers who take a sufficient interest in the matter are requested to suggest a name in their judgment more appropriate.

While it is true that it may take twenty to forty years for the final bringing into life of the proposition advocated, yet that should not discourage those who desire to seek their country's welfare. For are they not enjoying the benefits of the toil of those who labored for them, even before they were born?

It would not be surprising, however, should this proposition become a reality in a few years. For it can become so by political effect, and this proposition, more than any other, is calculated to unite the farmers of the north, south, east, and west; and this united power, if joined by that of labor, could soon obtain the end in view.

This is especially a fine field for our young men whose dormant energies could be devel-

oped, and to whom victory would give immeasurable renown.

The task is not easy, but those who are for easy tasks are seldom crowned with victor

BALLOT.

Please cut out this ballot and return to D. LUBIN, care of Weinstock, Lubin & Co., Sacramento, Cal. The ballot is to find out whether readers are for or against this proposition of having farm products forwarded by the U. S. Government, through the Post Office Department, at an even rate for any distance; and for exemption from taxation of farming lands owned and worked by American citizens, or those intending to become such.

For or Against
the Proposition

Name

Town

County

State

LABOR AND ITS INTERESTS.

[Reprinted from the Sacramento "Bee" of Sept. 30, 1893.]

A short time ago the writer handed an article on the proposition of forwarding farm products by the U. S. Government through the Post Office Department, and the exemption from taxation of the lands of American citizens owning and cultivating lands, to a mechanic (a carpenter), and asked his opinion on the same.

The mechanic read it through carefully, and handing it back said: "I suppose it will interest farmers. It ought to, anyway."

I then asked him if it would not interest workingmen—wage-earners—and he said: "I do not think so, for the proposition appears to center on the question of freight rates, and their reductions;" and he further said: "I cannot at present see how your proposition has any bearing on the questions confronting the wage-earner."

Continuing my interrogations, I asked him who it was that gave him employment, and I named a well-known contractor as his "boss" "Does he really give you work," I asked;" which he replied: "Yes, whenever there work to do."

"Do you have work to do the year around I asked; and he replied: "No; whenever there is work my 'boss' gives me a job."

It would then appear that your "boss" is in your "boss" after all; but that your "boss" has a "boss" that gives him work, and when the other "boss" gives your "boss" a job, he calls on you to help him, and thus becomes for a time your "boss."

"It is a strange way to put it, but you are right," he replied."

"Properly speaking," I said: "Your re

ie 'boss' that gives your 'boss' work. at makes your 'boss' a 'boss'; is this t?"

r heard it put that way before; but ght."

ay, tell me the name of your bosses'

led and thought, and smiled and nd was about to give it up, when, as den inspiration, he said: "The citi- ally."

re right," I said. "But tell me why zens generally only employ your boss why not at all times?"

e they do not need work done," he

are times, then, when all carpenter- ight to be done is done?"

hardly. Times may be dull some- i know."

y are times dull?"

ause people have not got money, I

y have they not got money?"

ause they did not get it, I suppose." it from whom?"

w do I know? Yes; come to think storekeepers are not selling enough l not earn enough profit to warrant improvements."

whom do the storekeepers sell?"

their customers."

o are their customers—the city peo- country people?"

h; but I should think that the ma- the trade really came from the

are right. Now tell me what would all the country people that generally i a city were suddenly to do abso- business with them of any kind, for ?"

y, unless they could make up the loss ther direction, that city would cer- me bankrupt and deserted."

would not be a good place at that ek for a job at fair wages, would it?"

nor at any wages; there would be no y price."

v, what would happen if, through ospheric change, the surface of the rendered impotent to yield any veg- ould we still be able to make a living ment in carpentering, or tinsmith- bing, or in machine shops, or in

B. "Until our stored-up food was exhausted some work would be done; but if this contin- ued we should all perish."

A. "Have we not, then, learned that vegeta- tion is the means of sustaining life, and that farm products is the source of employment, of wages?"

B. "Yes."

A. "The farmer, then, is the real 'boss,' the 'boss' of your 'boss,' is he not?"

B. "I must admit it."

A. "Does it not follow that if the farmer has money to spend, that there is a brisk trade, many improvements, plenty of work, and that wages are then firm?"

B. "It surely does."

A. "The welfare of the farmer, then, is a prime factor in work and wages, is it not?"

B. "Certainly."

A. "Now, then, if a farmer has no money, it may be because he has previously squandered it, may it not? Suppose, however, that the farmers of an entire county, or of the entire State, have no money, to what would you attribute the cause?"

B. "To a failure of crops, perhaps."

A. "Suppose there was no failure of crops, what then?"

B. "To low prices, I suppose."

A. "Who fixes the prices?"

B. "I do not know; can you tell me?"

A. "I think I can. The price is governed not alone by demand, but primarily by cost of production. And as farm products in this country may be divided into staples and non- staples—each governed by a different law of value—I shall be obliged to treat each separ- ately, in order to give you a proper answer." Staple products, such as we raise in this country, are largely raised in India, China, Russia, Asia Minor and North Africa. The wages in those countries are from four to fifteen cents a day, and the price of their products is governed by the cost of production. This price is generally arrived at in the great produce exchanges in Liverpool and London, and whatever price is fixed there becomes the price everywhere, is our price here."

B. "But we have near seventy million people in this country. Does the foreign price rule here for what we use as well?"

A. "It does; for if you wanted grain for a California flour mill and I wanted grain for export, we would both buy at the same price, would we not? Or would you care to pay more?"

B. "I would not; but it seems to me you have forgotten that we have a protective tariff."

A. "I have not forgotten; but you are in error when you think that the protective tariff is of any use whatever in exports; it is only of use for imports and for the protection of home manufactures."

B. "Yes, you are right; but if manufacture is protected by a tariff, why is there not some kind of protection for the export products, in order to protect the producers here as well as the manufacturers?"

A. "Because, as I told you before, the tariff is of no value whatever to protect exports."

B. "But if the conclusions we came to before are correct, that the welfare of the farmer is a prime factor in work and wages, it follows that, if the producer of staples has no protection, he is driven into competition with the lowest-priced labor in the world, and, as he is compelled, in addition to this, to pay the highest price for field labor here, his earnings must necessarily be small. Does it not so follow?"

A. "Yes; and this is the reason why he may often raise a large crop and yet lose money. But this is not all; for, in addition to the low prices he is compelled to receive for his product, by reason of competition with the lowest-priced labor countries, he is compelled to pay for a very large part of the cost for the protective tariff on imports and on the increased price of home manufacture caused thereby."

B. "It seems to me that it looks as if it were heaping on insult to injury in his case, does it not?"

A. "Yes, it seems so; in fact, it is so."

B. "If this is true (and I now believe it is) it may largely account for the periods of stringency, scarcity in the opportunities of labor, and the downward tendency of wages, does it not?"

A. "Yes; and it will be more so as soon as the cheap labor countries introduce modern implements and machinery. And this is largely the case already. I have myself seen, in 1884, fellah laborers working land on the Nile in Egypt with steam power, and in India English land owners are introducing the most approved agricultural appliances."

B. "If this is true, the time must come when the farmer of staples will receive still less for his product than the average he now receives, and this will, in turn, reduce the opportunity for labor, and lower wages; will it not?"

A. "It seems so."

B. "Can we not abandon the raising of staples?"

A. "No; for it is the greater portion of our production."

B. "Is there no remedy?"

A. "Yes; I pointed out the remedy in the paper I handed you and which you read. I asked you if it would interest workingmen wage-earners, and you said you did 'not think so.' Do you remember?"

B. "Yes, but I fail to see it even yet. Will you please state it now?"

A. "Certainly. It is that the United States government transport all farm products to the general ultimate market, at a fixed rate for any distance, and at a nominal price. The United States government to use her own vessels or railroads, or to hire it carried, paying the ruling rate for transportation, but charging the producer a nominal rate as postal, the difference to inure to the producer. The saving to the farmer will enable him to successfully compete with the cheaper labor of foreign countries, and yet give him a profit. He will continue to make a profit as long as the other nations do not do the same thing, which they cannot do because of the enormous costs to them for their standing armies, navies, and for their kings."

B. "Well, this plan seems plausible, but I see a defect in it. It is this: If farming becomes profitable, will not foreign and home capitalists buy up the land, and establish thereon tenants, who will be squeezed to the lowest earnings by the landlords, and thereby cause a still greater decline in wages than under present conditions?"

A. "Yes, that would surely happen unless prevented; and, if you read over my paper again, you will find a clause, that all lands owned and cultivated by American citizens, or those intending to become such, shall be exempt from taxation, but lands owned by aliens, or those whereon there is a renter, shall be taxed. The exemption of farming lands owned and worked by American citizens, and the great general tax caused by the postal carriage of farm products, will tend to increase the tax rate so high on lands owned by aliens, uncultivated lands, and those worked by renters, that in a short time such lands must find their way into the possession of owners, American citizens, who will do their own cultivating."

B. "But this increased tax, caused by exemption and by government postal carriage of

3, will that not fall very heavy on

o, it will scarcely be felt, if at all. For, all, as soon as the large land holdings more be farmed profitably, they will be actual settlers, and these settlers will so rapidly that there will be many help pay the tax."

ow can that be? Will not the multi- of these settlers tend to increase the tax for carriage of the additional farm; that will be raised?"

rue, but manufacture and commerce n be in such a flourishing condition tax will scarcely be felt."

have certainly been convinced with the bleness of your arguments up to now. I have yet to convince me why the portion of your great tax, according to position, will not fall almost entirely . And I may add, if you convince me or will be benefited, I will certainly be of your plan; but until you do, I will it as dangerous to the interest of wage

think we will both be safe as long as to the truth, therefore assent to nothing you can receive it with conviction." certainly shall do as you say."

o make clearer my argument I shall illustration: Imagine you see before ur, the car of 'Progress,' harnessed to re spirited horses called 'Nineteenth-' The driver is called 'Civilization,' is hand is a whip called 'Law.' Now the box is comfortably seated a man 'financier,' and next to him a man and Grabber,' *alias* 'Mortgagor,' *alias* 'tter-for-Rent.' In the car is a man 'anufacturer,' and another man called 'ce,' and another man called 'The Pro-'

All the men named are fine looking ly dressed. At the rear of the car and to it with a chain around his neck is man bearing a great burden on his . He is poorly dressed, and has care- tures. His name is 'Farmer.' Behind is an uncouth looking giant, with an in around his neck, the other end of fastened around the waist of 'Farmer' 'Farmer' he carries a great burden. is dressed in humble garb. His face is ed and wrinkled. His name is 'Labor.' en, seat yourself with me on this buck- led 'Observation,' and let us follow when she starts for the day's journey.

'Ge'long,' says 'Civilization,' as he cracks his whip, and away they go. The road is level and for a time all is well. But presently a steep hill is reached, and the sweat soon rolls down the faces of 'Farmer' and 'Labor.' In the steep descent which follows 'Labor' and 'Farmer' are pushed by the momentum toward the rear of the car with considerable force. 'Get back there, you rascals,' shout the occupants of the car in a chorus; 'don't come near us, you scum, or we will give you a taste of the whip.' Again they reach level land, and the car speeds on, and now comes a high, craggy ascent, steep and precipitous, and with redoubled effort 'Farmer' and 'Labor' patiently and laboriously toil upward. 'Let me take a seat in the car,' moans 'Farmer,' 'I can't keep up much longer, my strength is failing me.' 'I am almost exhausted, let me ride on the step if you will not let me inside the car,' cries 'Labor.' No attention is paid to them by those in the car, and presently 'Farmer' stumbles, and in falling pulls 'Labor' with him, and together they roll over jagged rocks, and pass through pools of mire; blood, sweat, and filth cover them. With almost superhuman effort they regain their feet, and enraged beyond endurance, 'Labor' seizes a huge flint with the intention of hurling it at the heartless men in the car. 'Finance' and 'Land-Grabber' observing this, become alarmed, and cry to the driver: 'Quick! Lash the curs with your whip, or they will hurl the stone at us; they might kill us.' At that moment the sound of a trumpet is heard, and from around the angle of a sharp curve appears a majestic being, God-like in presence and Divine in influence. 'I am Justice,' she cries, 'and I command you to halt.' At the command of Justice the car stops. 'Plead your case and I will decide,' Justice said; and thereat all began speaking at once, and a confused jumble of threats and mutual accusations filled the air. 'Silence!' cried Justice. 'Let there be order, and after my direction.' And each in turn stated his side of the case. But scarce had the trial begun, when 'Finance' and 'Land-Grabber' volunteered to help the prosecution. 'I do not need your services,' said Justice, and the trial finally came to a conclusion. 'My decision,' said Justice, 'is that 'Farmer' and 'Labor' take a seat in the car, this seat to be theirs by right from to-day, and for all time.' 'There is no room,' cried those in the car. 'Then some of you had better come out and take the place of 'Farmer' Come, 'Land-Grabber', you will do,' at

others, seeing 'Land-Grabber's' fate, cried, 'There is room enough; we will move closer together,' and 'Farmer' and 'Labor' took their seats in the car. Then did Justice remove their iron chains, and instead bound 'Farmer' and 'Labor' with a golden chain called 'Our interests are mutual,' and placing in their possession a magic wand called the 'Ballot,' said, 'Be governed by the whip called 'Law,' but with the wand 'Ballot' you can at any time temper its direction to ward off wrong. The golden chain that binds you together must never be removed, for only when united is your magic wand 'Ballot' potent. Justice, having delivered her decision, took the seat made vacant by 'Land-Grabber', and the car continued on its journey."

B. "I see what you mean; the illustration is intended to show that by the adoption of your proposition, there will be a re-distribution of wealth."

A. "I mean that my proposition will provide the farmer with that just share of return which he is justly entitled to, by paying back to him, in the form of savings on transportation, what he is compelled to pay out for protection. This will place him and you on the car of progress. This, together with the free tax, will enable him to lay by a surplus fund, and this surplus fund will buy labor."

B. "I freely admit the point. Yes, I will have more labor, but also more taxes, won't I?"

A. "Clear headed business men, when estimating a profit, do not judge the result by any one factor; they judge by the net return, and the question for you to decide is, whether the present conditions can give you steadier work, and at higher pay than the new proposition."

B. "No sir, I do not agree with you yet; the new conditions may give me steadier work at higher wages—which I admit it will—but if the surplus is eaten up by taxes, what do I gain?"

A. "Nothing, if the tax consumes it; but will it? In the first place there is a large percentage of labor who pay but a poll tax; secondly, another large proportion are on the assessment list for nominal amounts, paying from one to five dollars a year. Now, even should this new proposition double the tax rate of the country (which it would certainly not do), even then will not labor be a great gainer in its steady demand and upward ten-

dency? But more than that. Millions of idle wealth are now locked in vast tracts of land which might as well be China as here. My proposition will put this wealth, and presently this development alone will be more than able to pay the tax for postal transportation on farm products not by the land owners who will not work their lands, but by the citizens. Vast cities, the innumerable villages, the enormously increased financial, commercial and manufacturing interests that will be developed. Observe, in a season when there is a rainfall, the Sierras are covered with snow, a few abnormally warm days in the spring melt the snow, and the torrent comes down on the valley, threatening ruin. The snow is nearly gone from the mountains and the torrid days come on, your wheat comes dry, and the leaves droop, and the crop is ruined. On the other hand, when the mountains are covered with an abundance of snow, the scorching heat of the summer puts a redder blush on the fruits, fortifies moisture for the roots, and the crop is as perfect in its perfection. Now, whenever the wealth is hoarded up by the land-grabber, by the farmer, the manufacturer, and by commerce, the expense of agriculture—then labor has the condition of the fruit when there is snow on the mountains. But when the conditions shall be made to conform to my proposition—when agriculture shall be as just due—when it shall, like manufacturing, be protected, then the fount of plenty will overflow, and labor will receive its ample and just share, and not before."

B. "I confess I have no longer a suggestion to offer."

A. "But others will, and I caution you to beware of sophists, whose interest it will be to spread ridicule on this proposition."

B. "I will take good care to have the best reasons as I have compelled to give me before I change my mind."

A. "There is yet the matter of non-transported products, and the reason why they are not transported by the same methods as transported goods, but you will find the arguments set forth in the paper I gave you. Apply the reasons of our discussion on those arguments, and you will no doubt come to the same conclusion."

D. L.

Communicated opinions, with and without comments, will be published in next number of a similar pamphlet. Thirty thousand copies will be printed and distributed throughout the United States.

COMMUNICATIONS AND CRITICISMS.

to "Themis," Sacramento.

SACRAMENTO, Sept. 25, 1893.

THEMIS: Your issue of September is a criticism on my proposition as in the *Record-Union* of September

answer is final and conclusive as it is. Can we to understand that my proposition is unnecessary because the condition warrant it?

to understand that those who say it is being absorbed and accumulated at the expense of agriculture, are

to say, in spite of the steady and impoverishment of the agricultural class, a mercantile institution, built up a little while ago, will continue to persist in its course of progress?

to say that under present conditions poverty is to eliminate poverty, and for the distribution of wealth? If so, I might time to rebuke such statements made by Adam Smith, Ricardo, Reade, John Stuart Mill, Macaulay, Hyndman, Marx, Herbert Spencer, Henry George and thousands of others. It is then for the appearance of an ample and indication of the existing conditions, that they are as just and equitable as it should be, and that they tend in the direction of the highest good. But, Mr. Editor, have attempted no such vindication, I infer that you admit that the conditions exist; that you could offer no more contented yourself in overthrowing the one I offer. The question remains—overthrown it? By no means, as we enter on.

we proceed to answer your criticism. In relation to the value of a citizen: it wishes to be understood as intending the idea that a man is merely a machine, whose value depends upon the price of his product." No; not so, but this: The chief end of civilization should be the material welfare of the people for a progressive state can best be achieved thereby. Now, it matters little how the products produced by the citizen matters much what net return the citizen receives as his share for wages or

Indian coolie may work on cash-crops, that will bring \$1,000 each, and not but 5 cents a day for labor. In

other words, a citizen earning \$3 00 a day is likely to be more patriotic and intelligently loyal to the state's interests than one who is compelled to seek precarious and oft-interrupted jobs of work at \$1 00 a day.

In relation to distance competition, you say: "Even if it could be done, it would not be desirable to transport a car-load of wheat with the same rapidity and at the same cost that we transmit a telegraphic message." No, indeed; but who said it would? A cargo of wheat or cotton will not object going to its ultimate market by my plan, in a freight car, steamer, sailing vessel or ferry boat, nor did I anywhere even say that wheat or cotton should be transported as rapidly as perishable products that require rapid transit.

THEMIS further says, "neither would Mr. Lubin's plan of establishing distance competition, by compelling the railroads to transport farm products for a nominal compensation, be just." No; who said it would? I did say, however, that while the government would pay the transportation company, say, \$20 to carry a given product, that it would only charge the producer, say, \$2, and the \$18 difference is to be paid in taxation, by you, Mr. Editor, and me, and the millions of others who pay taxes.

This \$18, indirectly given to the farmer, would be a return to him of the \$18 paid out by him for "protection" to manufacturers; it will be his "protection." This is plain enough, is it not? Further on, THEMIS says: "No notice is taken of the fact that the best opinion of the times is tending in the direction of the single tax." Yes, Mr. Editor, "*due notice was taken of the single tax,*" but I deny the assertion that "the best opinion is tending in that direction." It is not tending in that direction because it is not practicable, and I shall submit as evidence the statement made by Henry George himself in his book, "Progress and Poverty." How does he propose to bring about "single tax?" I will now quote from his book:

"But the question remains: How shall we do it? We should satisfy the law of justice, we should meet economic requirements, by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all lands public property, and letting it out to the highest bidder in lots to suit, under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private rights to improvement." Are the present owners to be compensated? Let us see what

George says: "One day, the Third Estate covered their heads when the King put on his hat. A little while thereafter, and the head of a son of St. Louis rolled from the scaffold. The anti-slavery movement in the United States commenced with talk of compensating owners, but when four millions of slaves were emancipated the owners got no compensation, nor did they clamor for any. And by the time the people of any such country as England or the United States are sufficiently aroused to the injustice and disadvantage of individual ownership of land, to induce them to attempt its nationalization, they will be sufficiently aroused to nationalize it in a much more direct and easy way than by purchase; they will not trouble themselves about compensating the proprietors of land."

Now, THEMIS, for argument's sake, just assemble Messrs. Land, Steinman, Rideout, Haggin, Van Voorhees, Locke, Coolot, Burke, Bohl, Beatty, Ryan, Scheld, Cox, Steffins, Yorke, and Clark (all reputable citizens well known to you). Read the above quotations to them; ask them if they are ready to consent that their titles to land shall be transferred to the government, and you will learn in quick time the practicable value of Mr. George's conclusion.

Should you say that if not with their consent, then against it? Well, it takes two to create a revolution as well as a bargain. Supposing force is attempted? Is it not as likely to be defeated as to defeat the owner? What if it is beaten? Will its defeat not likely cost force its liberty, and thus bring about the reign of his Majesty — the I?

Supposing force wins? Who will then be in power? Who but the creatures of force? Will the destinies of the republic be safe in their hands? Have you, Mr. THEMIS, any guarantee that even after victory the force party will carry out Mr. George's proposition?

Is it not likely that once in power they will try to perpetuate that power by mutual grants to themselves of estates so vast as to sink into insignificance such holdings as the Haggin grant? Such things have been done; don't you think they can be done again?

Supposing, however, that in some unaccountable way, Mr. George's proposition could be carried out without a bloody revolution—which appears to me an impossibility—how would it be with the man who owns \$50,000 worth of land and he has a \$25,000 mortgage on it? What is to become of the mortgage?

Again, what is to become of the hundreds of thousands of orphans, widows, and invalids,

whose sole dependence is their parcel or country real estate?

And now lastly, the high rate of government tax on land, will not that still add to the burden of the farmer in his competition with and Russian labor?

If Mr. George replies by saying "No, a single tax will do away with the protective tariff, then I wish to know what is to become of the farmer as soon as the tariff is removed? Will it prevent 90 per cent. of our shoes, our hardware, and all other manufactures made in China, by American or Chinese manufacturers, and sent to this country? Will this be the best plan to eliminate protection? Answer these questions satisfactorily and I will not alone convert me to Mr. George's theory, but many ten thousand more besides."

This much for Henry George, and continue my answers to further criticism. THEMIS says the "proposition to invest the power of congress to exempt from taxation cultivated farm lands owned by citizen persons intending to become such, is being in its crudity."

As the laws stand to-day, yes; but if a general national law is adopted. If the sovereignty of the states will prevent free legislation, then the same result may be achieved by state law. The exemption from taxation of certain citizens is not new, for many states now authorize by law counties and municipalities to exempt from taxation for an indefinite term, certain industries, as an inducement to their establishment and continuance.

Claiming as I do that the ratio rate of product transportation should be eliminated, in order to give the farmer an equal return in the form of an internal protection to offset the enormous cost to him of the transportation of his manufactured goods, it follows that, if this is a fair plan, farming would become highly profitable if profitable, would drift into the rentier system. And in no better way can this pernicious and nation-destroying system be morally and economically eliminated than by a tax sufficient to make it utterly unprofitable.

If THEMIS will take the trouble to re-propose his proposition over again, and study it well, he will find that the ultimate results attained thereby is precisely that aimed at by Henry George. And that while Mr. George's plan requires a revolution costing more perhaps than a dozen civil wars, my plan can be successfully put into operation by a majority of ballots.

THEMIS further says: "The farm pro-

ign labor do not come into competition with the American farmer in the home

turkeys, eggs, butter, or hay, raised in a secure valley in California, Arizona, or other State, and sold to a near mining company may not, but the great

ring mills, the cotton factories, the mills, pay no higher rate for products of manufacture and consumption than consumers who buy for export.

Wholesale and London price governs, that price the dealer deducts the cost of transportation, and that is the standard price over the product is bought. Except where speculators temporarily raise or lower the price as they corner the market.

In conclusion, THEMIS says that my plan for the price of our farm products in the foreign and domestic market."

I think this would take place, for the basis of the world's market price is fixed in the United States, where very much lower labor of Europe, Asia, and Africa; and unless labor declines, the price will be maintained as now.

Including lines of THEMIS reads: "It is a cheat of trying to enrich one class of society by giving them that which another class."

THEMIS has truly described the condition now exists in tariff protection to consumers, and compelling the farmer to

government protective tariff book-keeping is done by single entry, and in a way that at the political economist accountant expert, could not strike a balance between the accounts of manufacture, commerce, and labor. I am for protection in every time, but let the "protection" protect not alone the manufacturer, but also protect the farmer and workingman. The tariff alone cannot do this, an end may be arrived at by the adoption of the plan outlined, thereby giving the farmer an equivalent to balance the account of securing to the farmer the highest price for his product that he is entitled to. This will enable the farmer to purchase products of manufacture to a much greater extent now; thereby labor will be in demand at fair rates, all of which will tend to commerce, and as a result will follow a stream of prosperity conducive to the ends of progress. And in no other

way can this be better brought about than by giving the farmer an internal protection in the form of rebate on transportation, by forwarding his products through the U. S. Post Office Department, and in the manner already set forth.

D. LUBIN.

To the Red Bluff "News."

MR. EDITOR: Your issue of 20th contained an editorial review of my article in the *Record-Union* Sept. 14th. You close the same with the following:

"If Mr. Lubin had stopped to consider a moment, he would have discovered that he had made an unanswerable and invincible argument against protection. He has demonstrated that protection means favoritism for the manufacturer and robbery for the farmer, and has shown, too, that in the nature of things it must always be so, because the manufacturer possesses advantages over the producer which cannot be overcome.

"The only remedy for this is justice, and justice consists in equality. Equality between the manufacturer and the producer can only be secured by taking from the manufacturer the advantages he possesses which enable him to legislate for the benefit of his class. To correct this wrong and place them on the same level, the protective features must be eliminated from our tariff legislation, and our tariff laws must be reduced to a revenue basis. If this be done and done well, the charge of class favoritism will no longer lie at the door of the government, and when it shall have learned to treat all citizens with impartiality and equality, it will have become well nigh perfect."

Now, Mr. Editor, if, as you claim, I made "an unanswerable and invincible argument against protection," you must also admit that I made "an unanswerable and invincible argument against free trade." Toward the close of my article, I said, "and let your cry be protection; protection to industry and protection to agriculture." This surely does not sound like a free trade cry.

At the present stage in the history of civilization, and with the very unequal political and social conditions surrounding us, it would perhaps lead to irretrievable retrogression were we to open our ports to the nations of the earth. That England has done so is true; but whether England is benefited thereby may be questioned. But England can probably withstand internal pressures which this nation could not. And even England's power to repress may suddenly give way, and when it does—chaos.

Were free trade established here, it would take but a short time to transform our princely manufacturers into lordly landlords—especially so, as with the removal of the tariff, agriculture would become highly profitable. The result would be as in England, lords and proletariat.

Even were such a state deemed permissible, the inflammable condition of the times would not render it advisable. And we may thank God that the conditions are such as they are, for the tendency in the direction of least resist-

ance is towards a higher civilization, towards progress.

The inequality to be overcome is not protection, but the unequal protection.

The actuating motive of the great staple producers in their cry of "free trade," was the tendency to overcome the inequality, rather than a love for free trade in the abstract. Once give them the equipoise, and there will be no more vehement advocates of protection.

There will then be no need to invoke the federal authorities' aid to permit the negro down south to vote for protection, but on the contrary, arm in arm, the former master and former slave will peacefully and smilingly go to the polls and deposit their votes for protection.

Such an equitable mode of protection is entirely possible and practicable by the adoption of the plan as outlined in my article which you criticised, and is the subject matter of this communication. It may be new, it may be radical, but I shall certainly consider it the only practicable plan, until I learn of one that can do more with less effort.

D. LUBIN.

To the Galt "Gazette."

SACRAMENTO, September 26, 1893.

MR. EDITOR: In your issue of September 23d, in criticising my article on transportation of farm products through the U. S. Post Office Department at an even rate for any distance, and for free tax on cultivated lands owned and worked by American citizens, or those intending to become such, you say: "It seems reasonable that this system could be applied to the products of the farm and orchard, but to our mind it could not be accomplished except by the government ownership of the transportation lines."

"The railroad corporations would object to carrying wheat, wine, or fruit under a mail contract, where only weight and not mileage were taken into consideration, unless under such conditions as to render the transportation as costly as under the present system."

You have evidently overlooked the true scope of my proposition. It was not intended as a method whereby the government could aid the producer in obtaining a lower rate on transportation, for it may not be possible for the government to do this. Nor is the proposition one of government ownership of railroads. It is, that farm products be carried by the government, through its Post Office Department, at a uniform rate for any distance in the United States, and to foreign ports of general markets. The great difference in the cost to the government is not to be borne by the transportation company but by the taxes of the people.

If you will kindly read over my paper again you will find ample reasons why the government should do this. You will also note the beneficial results likely to follow by the adoption of this plan.

D. LUBIN.

In Favor.

GAINESVILLE, TEXAS, Sept. 21, 1893.

DAVID LUBIN, *Sacramento, Cal.*—DEAR SIR: I have examined your plan of distributing agricultural products, and must say that, at first glance it looks impracticable, yet

there is much reason in it. I cannot see the products of the soil should not be treated with the same consideration that is given to literature. Of course, the subject is a vast one and to carry it out would involve a great deal of detail work. But our present postal system would be a big undertaking if it had to be undertaken now without previous experience but it can be done.

Yours truly,
W. T. ROBERTS, Editor *Hesperian*

From the "Nebraska Farmer."

The *Nebraska Farmer*, of Lincoln, Neb. says:

"In reply to your favor of September 1st we wish to say that we have carefully considered your new proposition for transportation of agricultural products, which strikes us as a very reasonable one, and we will be glad to see our government take hold of the scheme and put it in working order; yet we think there would be strong opposition to establishing such a system notwithstanding it would be, in our judgment, of great benefit to the agriculturists of this country."

An Educator's Opinion.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
LELAND STANFORD JR., UNIVERSITY
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA.

DAVID LUBIN, Esq., *Sacramento, Cal.*
SIR: I have read your paper on the mode of transporting farm products as mail matters are moved, and am very much interested in it. It is a novel suggestion, at least I have never heard it before. I would not offhand wish to say what of its merits. I think this may be said, however, that there is no more objection to a form of protection to agriculture than there is to an ordinary protective tariff. If we are to have the latter, we might as well have the former. I am not, however, convinced as yet that the destruction of special arrangements would not in the long run be beneficial. It seems to me that it is a good deal in your proposition, and I am glad to refer your article to Dr. V. Professor of Economics, and ask for his opinion, which would be of much more value to you than mine.

Very truly yours,
DAVID S. JORDAN

SACRAMENTO, Sept. 18, 1893.
PROF. DAVID S. JORDAN, *Leland Stanford University, Palo Alto.*—DEAR SIR: You are teemed favor of 16th to hand, and in your "I am not however convinced as to the destruction of all these special arrangements would not in the long run be beneficial. While it 'might,' the chances taken were greater than experience would justify."

Herbert Spencer somewhere says "there is an ultimate evolution, there is a rhythmic ratio;" and therefore, while we trust to an ultimate evolved state of trade, the rhythmic law might tend to obstruct freedom for a time, even for a long time.

Could we act on the world as a whole progress indicated or hinted at would be potent, but if we give up the tangible hope of the ultimate, we may act as we did when he dropped his bone in the way. China, Japan, India, Egypt, Russia,

chical countries are here, are really more easily drag them up to our hope for the ultimate good sent abandonment of protection. ents and concessions are decided that not so much for the sake of love of novelty, as because of ty.

ait until force becomes the factor? ou for your opinion, and enclose a Warner, whose opinion—whatever shall value.

Very truly yours,

D. LUBIN.

o like the opinion of some of the olars of the University.

ster, of the Cairo (Ill.) "Argus," lieve those nearest the market are the advantages they have." Cer- what loss would it be to those old those furthest from the market ster return for their product than ? Were your idea to prevail, Mr. ould establish a sort of protective- ound about the "market."

he market is usually a manufac- e, selling the bulk of their manu- e to furthest away from the market, ion, were your idea carried out— day—would be much like that of ican negro when asked by the mis- ive him a definition of good and 'When I have stolen other men's is good; when other men have ives—that is bad.' And on an- on, when asked to tell the differ- human beings and animals, point- , said: 'This is a little rogue, but ng to the missionary) are a big

ir practical ethics be any higher the African negro were our meth- rm to your proposition?

Cole, Esq., publisher "West Coast ," Tacoma, Wash.—DEAR SIR: In sm on my article in the *Record*- 9tember 14th, on the proposition of farm products through the U. S. Department at an even rate for any d for the exemption from taxation ned and cultivated by American i say: 'I must first acknowledge s of your conception, though I am d to accept it as a panacea for all ills.'

intimate a friendly assent to the on the part of the U. S. Govern- nding through its Post Office De- iterature," on account of its elevat- y.

st glanced over an assortment of ure," and I am of the opinion that levation can be had it will require, to this literature, something in the jack-screw, derrick, or an elevator, the elevating, in addition to the this trash. Here are some of the e books: "Camille," "Wife in Name e Burglar's Kate," "A Crown of Strikers and Communists," "A

Rogue's Life," "Ruffino," "A Modern Circe," "Bank Robbers," "The World, the Flesh, and the Devil," "The Old Mam'sell's Secret," "Mollie Maguires," "Fair Women," "Professional Thieves."

And this trash is carried 3,300 miles at a cost to the publisher and merchant at one cent a pound in any quantity, whereas it costs the U. S. Government some five or six times as much as it receives to do this. And you, Mr. Editor, and I, and every taxpayer foot the difference in taxes. A box of fruit, a sack of grain, how insignificant the "literature" when compared to these!

For the sake of progress, for the upbuilding of civilization, for the elimination of poverty, for the sake of all this, the right of way should be given to the producer and his product. And the only reason why "literature" usurps that right, is because the manufacturers of "literature" have a "pull" in the high places, while the poor producer is busy with "Women's Rights," "Silver," "Greentacks," "Government ownership of railroads and telegraphs," "Immigration," "National banking," and a host of other "issues."

A little further on you say: "If, however, farm products are to be thus equally treated in transportation, then why not coal, lumber, products of the mines; in short, why not everything?" Because "everything" is "protected" by a tariff, and farm products are not. And because some farm products are perishable, and lumber and iron are not. Because the farmer is the bulwark of our nation, and all other industries are subsidiary; they do to fill in with.

D. LUBIN.

The "Daily News" of Pensacola, Fla., in its issue of September 23d, says: "But we are unalterably opposed to any proposition to lump all the expenses of transportation and tax every citizen for his proportional part. The merchant would be benefited; the small man would be eaten up, however, by his wholesale neighbor, as the small merchant in turn would get cheap transportation at the expense of the farmer."

The *Daily News* is respectfully requested to glance over my article again, and he will see that I did not advocate the carriage by the Post Office Department of merchants' goods or manufactures. What I advocate is that farm products be carried that way, and farm products only. As for lumping all the expenses and taxing all the citizens to pay their proportion, that is precisely what the protective tariff does, and unjustly so to the producer of staples. Am I right, Mr. Editor?

Well, my plan proposes to give an equitable return to those paying for "protection" but receiving none. That is but common justice, is it not?

The *San Jose "Mercury,"* of September 18th, closes a short review of the proposition herein advocated thus: "This is the kind of politics that ex-Senator Ingalls would call an 'iridescent dream; it is too pure for practice.'"

Indeed! Notwithstanding, however, I would not be surprised, Mr. Editor, if in a short time even you would advocate this "iridescent dream." Thirty thousand copies of the "ir-

descent dream" sent to 30,000 readers—some of whom think—and 30,000 next month, and so on, until the dream is a dream no more. May this not awaken a nation contented to sleep on the prostrate giant—the producer? Suppose the giant should gather up his loins and arise in his might and demand justice! Suppose that he is seconded in his demand by a new and powerful ally—labor—would not the dream likely resolve itself into a wide-awake reality?

Nor would it at all be strange if this did happen. That the producer was the "under dog" in politics for so long a time is true; but it need not always be so. Heretofore his political cry, like Joseph's coat, was of many shades, and its multiple hue cast a shadow which enveloped him with political oblivion; therefore, he slept a peaceful political sleep, too sound for awakening. And while he slept the other fellows "got in their lick." Let him now have horse sense enough to cry protection!—equal and just protection! and with labor's co-operation who can hinder him from just victory?

The editor of the Chicago "Tribune" says: "The opinion of the *Tribune* is, that it would cost the government far more to transport the products and commodities of the people of the United States than it costs the citizens now." That depends: First of all, if you mean by products and commodities, produce and manufactured goods, then you are mistaken as to the scope of my proposition. Nothing is embraced under it that is not a farm product in its natural state; not beer, but hops; not flour, but grain. Now, when I confine your meaning to farm products alone, that again leaves us in the dark until we clear the meaning. If you mean it will cost the government more than the citizen, I must disagree with you. Any citizen or set of citizens cannot make near as good a bargain as the government could as soon as it will be in a position to contract for the entire quantity of farm product. If, however, you mean that when this proposition is adopted that it will cost the government more than now, that is self evident, for my plan calls for that saving to the producer which will equalize his loss caused by the protective tariff, and my proposition would not have any importance unless it did "cost the government far more." This "far more" is to be the saving to the farmer, and is to go to him as an equivalent for that which he pays out for protection.

The editor of the *Tribune* further says, "That commodities are carried no where in the world as cheaply by ship or rail as in the United States." In the abstract, Mr. Editor, you may be right, though I doubt it. Practically, you miss the question. Does it cost \$400 a car to transport a carload of fruit from Wales or France or Germany to London? Yet that is the price from California to New York. The place where the producer receives the lowest price is where he is furthest from the market, and once this distance question is removed, the great West alone can, by unimpeded development, maintain a population quadruple to its present extent, and in greater comfort than anywhere else in the world.

"The American Cultiva

BOSTON, MASS., Sep.
D. LUBIN, Esq., *Sacramento, Cal.*
I read with interest your article in *ment Weekly Union*, and must confess it is a novel proposition. However, I believe that such a system could be because it would amount to a cost for the railroads, which are not now money. No capital could be secured for new railroads if they must carry freight at a uniform rate for all distances.

GEORGE B. JAMES
Publisher *The American*

In reply to the above, I state that I have certainly made a mistake. I have advocated a proposition that the railroads carry farm products at a uniform rate for all distances. But I do advocate that by the United States government the ruling rates to the transportation of farm products be reduced to a nominal rate, equal to the distance in the union, to the difference to be paid in taxes by all.

The saving to the producers is the cost to them for protection, and the benefit of which goes to the farmer, and the conditions are now.

I advocate no confiscation; I advocate much property myself to do so, even if inclined, which I am not. My proposition, if adopted, will stop confiscation of a good portion of the just earnings of the farmer. Confiscation of a good portion of the just earnings is caused by the protective tariff, but, as I am a confirmed protectionist, I am convinced of its tendency toward the perpetuation of our American institutions, but not in its one-sidedness.

Protection is politic. Should it be just?

We have become so accustomed to doing wrong that it seems normal. I am inclined to hide and dodge what I should not hide and dodge. Injustice, and no shrug, or wink, or twist, or turn, or whine, or conciliatory waiver, or stubbornness can make it right.

The producers are paying for protection and are receiving value for their money. Or, the producers are paying for protection and are not receiving it, right? Which is it? If I am right, I shall show a way how justice may be done. I shall say it is the only way until the Publisher, or some one else can show a better road to justice.

Further on you say: "Again, in a free country, it would be a difficulty to make one rate for farmers, another for merchants, a third rate for coal miners, a fourth rate for lumber dealers, and so on. It might be for the farmer's sake out of a hole in this manner, it would revolutionize other classes of business. It would be an agreeable proposition to farmers, but a very disagreeable proposition to the stockholders of the railroads' stockholders themselves."

This is a free country, and the very thing is being done now, nor is it revolutionary. A publisher may send a letter to a novelist from New York to San Francisco and land them there in six days, through

ment, and which costs the United ment from \$120 to \$150, and for government only receives \$20. trashy, I mean just what I say.) which is of greater importance to of this nation: to help the pub- fully Maguires," "The Burglar's fe in Name Only," etc., etc., or for onest farm produce at a rate to the producers for the tariff which and do not receive? mber require no equaution; they are the tariff; but if you mean that (under my proposition) be some djust a schedule of rates between in, you are right. But this would to solve than a thousand problems d in postal carriage. vo lines may be answered, that it more disagreeable to the railroad to receive pay from the United ment for services rendered than for them to receive the same they do now from the farmer. it?

ky Mountain Herald."

Esq., Sacramento, Cal.—DEAR SIR: ally read your proposition in re- ansportation of farm products. I why the farm products of the ld not receive the same protection led to manufactures. Your plan y re-distribute and equalize the ansportation, which should be classes alike. It would increase ent the cost to the consumer, but al would scarcely perceive it, as ke up the difference would be so would be lost sight of in the of first cost, and, in any event, compared with the increased cost ured goods, under the present ection.

Respectfully, R. G. DILL,

y Mountain Herald, Denver, Colo. o Editor Dill, I wish to state proposition be adopted) that, in not alone would there be no in- as at all, but there would probably decrease. The great land grants eliminated, all lands cultivated s, and a nominal fee for transpor- d so increase the magnitude of opulation that the per cent. and uld decline.

orthwest Horticulturist."

TACOMA, Wash., Sept. 23, 1893. Dear Sir: Your favor and copy of osition," etc., has been received. ce gives me the impression you ed some ideas worthy of careful . If Pacific coast fruits can be prices to producers* through the s, producer, consumer, and States nefited. C. A. TONNENSON, st Horticulturist and Sec'y State Horticulture. s "to producers" have been in-

Mr. Filcher on the Scheme.

On the proposition, Placer Herald, Sept. 23d, says:

"To establish that the situation in this county is as described is not a difficult matter. It is recognized as a fact by all observing men of the present day, and its alarming consequences are the subject of much serious thought and of no small amount of discussion. It is one thing, however, to discover an evil and to note its tendency, and it is another thing to point out a practical remedy.

"Henry George, an economist of note and one of the advanced thinkers of to-day, proposes a remedy for the evils under discussion by putting all taxes on to land, and in some sections the acceptance of this idea as the best solution is rapidly gaining ground.

"Mr. Lubin reverses George's theory and would exempt all lands owned and worked by American citizens, or those intending to become such, from all taxes whatever. He goes further; he would move the farmer's produce to market by a system similar to the postal service, by which a stamp on a sack or a car load of grain, fruit, or other produce should carry it to its destination whether the haul be greater or less.

"This would eliminate distance and put all producers on an equal footing as to advantages of market."

"The Santa Clara."

SAN JOSE, CAL., Sept. 18, 1893.

MR. D. LUBIN: Your printed article sounds like a battle-cry to me. I am wonderfully enthused over it. It seems to me you have struck more than one key-note. Especially am I pleased with the freight-stamp plan. I shall be glad to present the paper before our Grange (of which I am a member), and will, if possible, read it at next Saturday's meeting. I will also publish it entire in my October magazine. This interests me more than anything I have heard on the "situation." I believe there is a living germ in it that shall grow, and grow, until the people may rest in the shade of the protecting tree which is evolved.

(Signed) CARRIE STEVENS WALTER,
Editor of Santa Clara.

Editor Rice of the Orange County (Orlando, Fla.) "Reporter," in a communication says:

"Your plan embraces many practical ideas that will some day obtain, but just how long a time it will require to agitate, educate, and organize the masses up to the point to act upon your theory, is a question that time only can answer. The masses do not read much, and are slow to adopt, or favor the adoption, of a new order of things."

I beg to differ with editor Rice. Never in the history of social organization was there a time when the masses read more, knew more, or did more to better their conditions than now.

The "Times" of Oakland, of September 19th, gave a lengthy synopsis of the product postal carriage system in its editorial columns, but expressed no opinion for the time being.

A Brooklyn Opinion.

In a letter dated Sept. 21st, from Mr. Wm. Churchill, editor of the *Brooklyn Times*, he says: "The conditions, you see, are different here." Meaning that, in his judgment, while my proposition would be good for the west, it would not, if adopted, be good for the east.

Is not the editor mistaken? If the condition of the producer were made better throughout the union, would not the eastern producer benefit as well? Again, Brooklyn is a manufacturing city, and if the west prospers will this not bring orders to Brooklyn for manufactured goods to a much greater degree? Will not their outstanding accounts be firmer? Will it not tend to give employment to thousands of Brooklyn's idle workmen? Will not the west, if prosperous, absorb the surplus men and women now eking out a miserable existence in Brooklyn, and giving them a better living than Brooklyn ever can under present conditions?

The "Maryland Farmer."

BALTIMORE, Sept. 25, 1893.

D. LUBIN, Esq.—*Dear Sir*: We have read with interest the extract forwarded to *Maryland Farmer*. While we have not had the requisite time to canvass thoroughly the important subject upon which it treats, we are of the opinion that the U. S. government should give the agriculturist all the advantages which are afforded the most privileged classes through the medium of the mails. If thousands of tons of books and newspapers are transmitted at nominal rates, why not the like advantages to the agriculturists?

But whether, on the examination of the whole field, it would be practicable, we are not now ready to affirm.

The matter of tariff protection to farmers we have considered to be wholly a farce, and your argument is very good in that direction.

Yours respectfully, H. R. WALWORTH,
Editor *Maryland Farmer*.

The Indiana County "Gazette."

MR. D. LUBIN.—*Dear Sir*: I have read with no little degree of interest the press clipping sent me. While your proposition for the transferring of farm products as mail matter is at first startling and unique, to me it gives an inkling of one remedy to the great agricultural depression.

In Pennsylvania, however, a scheme such as yours must be preceded by one other, the question of better roads. With us it is a question of cheap transportation between farm and railway. This, however, is more of a local problem. Your plan is one of national interest. I am yours truly, WALTER H. JACKSON.

"Peck's Sun," Milwaukee, Wis.

MR. DAVID LUBIN, *Sacramento, Cal.*—*DEAR SIR*: I have read with interest your article in the *Sacramento Record-Union*, on the moving of farm products. I have written a short editorial, for this paper of 30th September, approving the scheme. Yours truly,

Rob't W. Wilson, Editor.

Belle E. Matteson, Editor of "*The Sun*," N. D., in a communication give her opinion that the principal objector proposition is that it calls for class legis Is not the protective tariff class legis Yes; but two wrongs do not make a right but is one wrong a right? To protect would no longer be a wrong. Therefore tect both and let us be right. Again sh "If rented and unoccupied lands were tl ones taxed, the tenant, who would have the tax by way of additional rent, would no chance to compete with the ma owned and worked his land." The *Sun* rect. This is one of the principal aims proposition. If it is adopted it will do with renters for good. Do we need argt to show that the renting system is a Have we not an object lesson in the co of Ireland? Toward the close she asks new plan would not increase product greatly as to cause a decline in price to It will increase the production largely, l to a loss; for the surplus can, under my osition, be exported. And until all countries adopt the same plan, we can, proposition, meet them with ease. Tl concludes: "However (by its adoption) pears the masses would be greatly ber inasmuch as living would be cheapene the demand for labor greatly increased."

T. A. Bland, of Washington, D. C., in munication, Sept. 23d, says:

"To extend the benefits of the postal s to agricultural products, would undou be a boon to the farmers. But is it prac while the railways, canals, etc., are ow corporations?"

Why would it not? The U. S. gover now transports thousands of tons on roads. It is only a question of bulk and v Who shall own the railroads, and an eve for farm products for any distance are ty ferent questions. The government migl the railroads to-day, and run them at or cost, and yet not cover the proposition advocate. What I advocate is postal r nominal fee—for all farm products, s eliminate the ratio rate for distance or staples, and for giving an equitable ret the producer of staples, who now pay protection tariff, but receives no protecti

The Iowa "State Register," of Des M in a communication, says: "It is impr ble, for the mail matter is moved at a higher rate than is now paid for moving products." The *Register* is asked to e how 165 pounds of trashy novels can ge New York to California for \$1.65? And editor tell us how much it costs for fow 165 pounds of peaches from California t York?

I grant it will cost the government m do the carrying than now, for now it nothing, simply because the government ing no carrying of farm products.

My purpose is to have the governmen this "pay" to be in lieu of protection producer of staples, and for the elimina distance competition to the producer o staple farm products.

"Dunlap, editor of the "Times-Record," City, N. D., in a communication dated number 26th, says: "Your ideas on the transportation question certainly have the notion of being novel. But to bring about a rate would require government ownership of railroads. This latter condition can, by my notion, be brought about too speedily for the public good. The government must own the railroads, or the railroads will be government."

There is a tendency in the direction of the resistance, in nature and in social conditions.

And when a difficulty confronts, which we have not patience enough to solve properly, the tendency is to solve it any way. And if I find that the selling price of farm products is a meagre net return, our "least point of resistance" terminates in the cry, "the railroad is oppressing us." Now, Mr. Editor, is it not true that the incident of *great distance* to the market is doing the mischief, is it a real robber? Germany, France, England, America, Holland, Denmark, if they had our distances before reaching their ultimate markets, could they survive? No, not for a moment it would eat them up. Then, too, the colossal and enormous tax for tariff protection. Is the farmer protected? Is it not the manufacturer who pays for it? Is it not the producer who is robbed? Does he receive value for what he produces?

No; for his price is fixed in Liverpool or London. Is he not robbed? And yet we will do (we do) to lay it all on the back of the railroad. Is it just? Government ownership of railroads might leave us in the same position to-day, for it might cost the government as much to run them as the corporations, in order to get their profits. Give the farmer an ample return for the protection he pays for; let the farmer not receive, and remove the unbearable construction of cost for distance, and agriculture will thrive, manufactures will flourish, labor will be in demand. Our country will become the greatest political power in the world.

There will then be no need to close our natural gates to the poor, for our country, by diligent effort, can be made to support in its triple the population she now has.

As long as a narrow, selfish and unjust system is permitted to prevail, we are forced to conditions not at all to our liking. Must we continue so because we lack wisdom or are we to make them better? Further on you

you, I cannot fully agree. I am an advocate of the Henry George single tax idea."

Now, Mr. Editor, I suppose you will agree that there is no stronger advocate of "single tax" than Henry George himself. And yet I am sure that, rather than postpone a present possible era of progress, he would waive his "single tax" proposition altogether by accepting a possible solution. When single tax means confiscation without compensation, when it means a deluge of blood, when it means a general "reign of terror" such as the world has never seen; when it means that if force is defeated the mediæval tyrant will again rule, that if force wins we may have Goths and Vandals to rule us; when a host of Ghengis Khans, Tamerlaines, Robespierres, will sit on bloody thrones, of what value then will be the single tax? You have only to read Mr. George's book, "Progress and Poverty," to see that I am not drawing on my imagination. My tax proposition will accomplish just what Mr. George aims at. It will do away with renters on farming land, and that in a manner consistent with law and in harmony with existing rights of property. Further on you say:

"What the farmer of the west needs is cheaper transportation. Your idea of nationalizing transportation and giving a postage rate would be a God-send to everybody."

No, Mr. Editor, not for everybody. Suspenders, kettles, pitchers, and crackers are commercial drummers. Hops, honey, peaches and wheat are the customers. What sensible drummer would first cripple his customers and then expect trade?

The railroads may have done some "cinching," but nothing so wasteful, so destructive, so stupid was ever perpetrated by the railroads as the remorseless cinching suffered by the producer of staples (the customer) at the hands of the manufacturer (the drummer) when he (the drummer) got himself "protected" at the expense of his customer, the producer. Toward the close you say:

"When one specific interest is protected, all others should be equally protected, or an injustice is done."

I agree to a T, and as the tariff can not protect the producer of staples, the saving on transportation can be adjusted to act as an equivalent; this alone can bring justice.

Mr. M. T. Thompson, the editor of "American Farm and Horticulturist," of Richmond,

to the question of taxes, as proposed by

.., says: "We would have little to ship to the west, and if the farmers in the west, where they have the new, rich, virgin soil, would reach our market so cheap it would entirely destroy our old settled section."

Granted that you have little to ship west, have you also little to ship east? Now, Mr. Editor, I would like to know on what ground you base your assertion, "and if the farmers in the west, where they have rich, virgin soil, could reach our market so cheap they would entirely destroy our old settled section." Does not the product of the farmer of the west reach your market now? Has it destroyed your section? What objection, then, can you have to his receiving a greater net return than now? Do you fear a greater production? Will not the proposition under consideration also bring a greater number of consumers? You appear to fear the fertility of the western soil being pitted against your old settled section. What is the matter with your "old settled section?" Why is it not as fertile as the newer section? Surely, age of settlement can have nothing to do with it; for I saw land under cultivation in Italy, between Genoa and Rome, that must have been farmed before Romulus founded Rome, and it was fully as fertile, if not more so, than our new land here, and one of the finest orange groves that I ever saw was near Jaffa, in Palestine, and I suppose that same land was farmed before Abraham was born. Was Virginia land ever fertile? Then, why is it not fertile now?

Is it because Virginians do not understand farming, or is it because they lacked the means to procure fertilizers? This lack of means, was it not caused by receiving too low a net return for products? Why did they not receive a higher return? Are not your staple productions governed by similar productions where labor is much lower than in this country? And when you exchange this net return for necessities, do you not pay "protection" prices?

Does that help you to fertilize your land? Does it not rather keep the producers of Virginia down to a "bed rock" level? The man in the Greek fable who was compelled to roll a stone up hill forever—are not the producers of Virginia in a similar fix?

Have the Virginia farmers no need of a better net return? When California will get it, will not Virginia also get it? Has not Virginia ever struggled for free trade? And why? Not because they did not recognize the utility of

protection. Her statesmen were too greedy to have known this. They opposed "protection" because it protected Massachusetts the expense of Virginia. Now, then, if Virginia can receive back her outlay for protection in the form of a rebate on transportation the plan under consideration proposes she object to this equalization because California will also be benefited?

To return to the virgin soil question: this score, Mr. Editor, you need have none for we here are not much better off in this respect than is Virginia. The brief recapitulation of soil fertility history here is as follows: The first plow that turned the soil brought back from 15 to 30 sacks of wheat to the acre, but now the same soil, summer fallowed, brings 8 to 15 sacks, and in many instances only 5 to 8. What robbery of the soil! Yes, the robbers are here, and they will tell you that the net return for wheat hardly interests the mortgages, and investment manures are out of the question. When produced gold by the ton and had our soil we were in good trim, and at that time not need manure, but now when we manure we must first pay for "protection" when we have done that we have as a reward—what? Precious little.

Granted that Virginia and California can have free trade—and they cannot and do not, in the best interests of the union—they refuse an equivalent return for their lay? Should they alone refuse protection? rest content by permitting New England to receive and absorb, and for the rest of the country to pay, ever pay?

Let it be protection, but for agriculture as well as manufacture. And as a tariff to protect agriculture, let the form of agricultural protection be in transportation, by forwarding farm products through the U. S. Post-Office department at a nominal rate for any distance.

The Meadville, Pa., Messenger, by its editor R. B. Brown, in a communication, says:

"Remedy impracticable; but the evils and something must be done to protect farmers from the rapacity of railroad managers who are amassing millions by the manipulation of stocks, bonds, and other property. They are the greatest highway robbers in the world."

The *Messenger* is not the only one to make such assertions. It may be questioned whether it deserves attention, for the reason that no attempt is made to show which of the railroads are the highway robbers and which are not.



400, 402, 404, 406, 408, 410, 412,
K. STREET.

NEW YORK OFFICE 274 CHURCH ST. SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE 25 SANSOME ST.

Sacramento, Cal. October 20th, 1893.

OPINIONS ON THE

NOVEL PROPOSITION.

REVOLUTIONIZING THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH. FARM PRODUCTS

MOVED AS MAIL MATTER AT A UNIFORM RATE

FOR ALL DISTANCES.

The readers are respectfully requested to fill out the ballot, and to make such comments in relation to the proposition on this page as may seem to them proper, and return same to D. LUBIN, Sacramento.

BALLOT.

For or Against
the Proposition

Name

Town

County

and comments in relation to the publication of this book as
before the subsequently mentioned to fill out the paper and

FOR THE COUNTRY

NOTED TO BE THE BEST OF THE COUNTRY

THESE ARE THE BEST OF THE COUNTRY

NOVEL PROPOSITION

CHAPMAN OR THE

CHAPMAN OR THE

October 20th

BUTTER

THE AMERICAN
PAPER WORKS

1000

1000

NEW YORK OFFICE 214 CHURCH ST. NEW YORK OFFICE 214 CHURCH ST.

NEW YORK OFFICE 214 CHURCH ST.





are, then we have a strange law here, a
r exception to the general rule, viz:
s soon as a man engages in the railroad
s, however honest he may have been be-
comes a highway robber. If this were
is high time for religious teachers to
to and exhort their flocks to beware of
ger of of associating with or becoming
l men. Yet strange to say, I never
f such apparently necessary warnings.
the editor of the *Messenger*, in all sin-
if he too would become a highway rob-
soon as he would own a few railroad
Or would he be an exception to the
If so, we have a remedy, sure enough,
ing the editor at the head of the rail-

Mr. Editor, has it ever occurred to you
e man who lives in Hoboken, and em-
e railroad to carry his product to New
edom if ever grumbles at the charges?
man in Wyoming, who also ships pro-
o New York, does a great deal of growl-

is the cause, pray? Is it not the cost
ance? Now, it is this very distance that
progress. It is this very hindrance
uses the hundreds of thousands of un-
ed.

this very hindrance that causes many
brains to shout "close the gate!" "put
bars!" when we have room for quadru-
present population.

his very hindrance that engenders want
ery in California, with scarce a million
alf population, when she can maintain
y millions as France can, and in better

his very hindrance that causes the pro-
to stand, like the man in the Greek
p to the chin in water and yet thirst,
rnucochia's fount overflowing with pre-
od for the millions in God's image, de-
them, and given freely for hogs to
in, and to rot on the land, and to be
l into the water, and to poison the air.
ps, Mr. Editor, you may think I am
; on my imagination, but I assure you,
I can easier prove what I set forth,
u can that the railroads "are the great-
way robbers in the world." Distance
indrance, and to remove it I offer as a
my proposition of forwarding farm
s at a nominal rate through the Post
eapartment of the government's service.

The Grand Rapids, Mich., Telegram-Herald.

The editor, in a communication, Sept. 22d, says:

"The scheme you suggest is certainly a novel
one. I am not prepared to indorse it; but be-
lieve that sooner or later the unjust discrimi-
nations which you would correct will be cured
by the congestion of population in localities
contiguous to the producers."

In Vermont, or even in Michigan, perhaps,
yes; for the great northwest, south, and west,
no. Nor, indeed, would it be well for the coun-
try as a whole, were your theory to prevail.
The farm product of Massachusetts is, perhaps,
insufficient for the needs of her population,
because there "the congestion of population in
localities contiguous to the producers" is all
right, for the population is supported by man-
ufacture. Suppose we, too, congested popula-
tion in localities contiguous to the producers,
by the development of manufacture, what
would become of Massachusetts and her con-
gested population? Would not their enforced
idleness compel them to emigrate? They
would then come to California, and the States
named would but change relative positions.

Were we even to attempt this, we could not
carry it out. A California ranch cannot be
worked like a Massachusetts farm. Here we
have a rainy season, and when that is over the
sky is almost cloudless until the time for rain
comes again. This makes it practicable to
adopt but one method of farming, and the
ground is generally put to a single or continu-
ous use. Thus the fruit-grower buys his veg-
etables, hay, and breadstuffs. The wheat-
grower buys his fruit, vegetables, and meat,
and under this system, and without manufac-
ture, the Natoma vineyard, 18 miles east of
this city, can supply a city as large as Albany
with grapes, and yet this is only one vineyard
—a large one, it is true. And if all agreed to
drink only California wines and brandies, the
Vina vineyard—the property of the late Sena-
tor Stanford—could supply New York city with
wines and brandies. Then comes A. T.
Hatch, the fruit-grower, and he could easily
supply Brooklyn with fruits.

But these are, in comparison, insignificant
in magnitude when compared with the great
wheat fields—no, wheat kingdoms.

The Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys
can furnish flour for California, New York,
Pennsylvania, and some more States.

Friend editor, the problem is one of trans-
portation and nothing else.

At the close you say, "Time is the chief fac-
tor in this process of evolution."

"Time?" What has "time" done for India, for China, for Egypt, for Asia Minor, for Russia? "Time" is a nonentity. Man alone, by his energy, by his power of seeing, by his resolution, his tenacity, and by a will pregnant with purpose, has accomplished. And because he can and has accomplished, we may know that he is in the image of God.

Mandon, N. D., Pioneer, in its editorial review of the proposition, says: "Besides, what would the farmers who own their land near the eastern centers of population say? Would they like such a scheme as that proposed?"

Well, that depends; the fish-head and hog-belly eastern farmer would not, but the progressive farmer would, because he would know that the products of the several sections are not all alike, do not mature at the same time that his does, and that he will still have the great advantage as to time, and nearness to the ultimate consumer. He will also know that if more product will come, a greater population will also come to consume it.

Should California receive her thirty million population—which she can support if the conditions permit it—that this will increase the population of New York, Chicago, and the other great eastern cities, not with loafers, but with workers, and this will give the eastern truck farmers a steadier market than they now have. Would the *Pioneer* add insult to injury? Would he have the great west, south, and northwest pay for tariff protection on their staple products and receive nothing in return, and in addition place another wall of protection around the eastern manufacturing centers to keep the southern and western producer out?

Shall we buy eastern clothing, dry goods, hardware, and thus support "your" truck men in addition to the tariff, and then climb your Chinese wall to sell you our products? Come, Mr. Editor, what kind of logic, what kind of justice have we here?

Does it not sound like "We are the great hogs; we will eat until we burst; let the patient men of a distance starve for ought we care; only let them send us orders and we will do the rest?" Now we don't think much of hogs out here.

"**The Lagrange Graphic**," Lagrange, Ga., of September 29th: "It would be a good thing for far-away California. It would 'bust' Florida and be a heavy load on the balance of the country."

Will editor Randall kindly tell us if will "bust" Florida?

Perhaps he believes that California at postal rate of transportation would compare with the ordinary mode of transportation he does he is mistaken, for by my proposition the postal rate would be for every section.

If this is not meant, then is it the quantity likely to be marketed that the fears? If so, then are we to stop progress west in order to give Florida a chance to still?

In the first place, Mr. Editor, can you tell me whether California and Florida mature and are marketed at the same time is it at times far enough apart to avoid competition? Please answer!

In the second place, what harm will it do if Florida should California orange groves able to make a greater net earning? How would it "bust" Florida? Tell me why Florida as well as California, would not be benefited by me why it will be a heavy load to the balance of the country? You will do me a great deal if you can. You will also save me the expense of printing several more 30,000 editions of pamphlet and the expense of mailing them.

Will it not put more money in the pockets of producers? Is this busting them?

Will it not develop the resources of the country? Will it not be the means of orders for goods to northern manufacturers? Will this "bust" Florida? Will it not create a steady demand for labor? Will this "bust" Florida?

When the southern white man and Southern black man will (under my proposition) find it to their interests to vote for protection to north and protection for south will not this identity of interests do away with the race hatred? Will this "bust" Florida?

Oh, Mr. Editor, I am awfully anxious to hear your reply. I want to know the reason "bust" that will "bust" Florida if this proposition is adopted.

"**Living Issues**," Boston, Mass.—The following is a communication, October 2d, says: unquestionably one step in the right direction. The discussion and propagation of your proposition is pertinent and profitable."

"**Nelson County News**," Lakota, N. D.—The opinion by the editor is the following: would encourage the settlement of farms all over the United States by the removal of large cities."

St. Louis (Mo.) "Chronicle."

R CHRONICLE: Your issue of the 21st contains a criticism on my article in the *Sacramento Record-Union* of September 19. I propose a plan for the forwarding of farm products by the United States government, through the Post Office Department, the exemption from taxes all lands now worked by American citizens, or tending to become such) and towards of same you say:

"We would like for him to consider the this long-haul arrangement on the of St. Louis county, Mo., and of St. Louis, Ill. Under it, they would have part of the freight from California to St. Louis in common with their own. For, of course, if the rate is uniform, regardless of distance, it would have to be averaged and the average rate taken at the expense of people who have the short haul."

"I have misunderstood my meaning. For your article you will find the question, 'Upon whom, will fall the burden of these?' and the answer is, 'Upon all who farm.' Further on I say:

"The workingman consent to be taxed an additional tax from which you expect a refund? Yes, assuredly he will, as soon as he can demonstrate that by his doing so it will bring him a greater possibility of a steady market for labor than is now possible."

"The merchant agree to it? Yes; for an additional tax to him by this method will give him your value as a customer."

"The manufacturer agree to it? Yes, he has the same reason as the merchant. Will the banks of bonds and mortgages agree to it? Yes, it can be demonstrated that his property and mortgages will then possess a greater security."

"I see that there is here no question of

"It is proposed that the United States government pay for any difference in the rate, what it receives from the producer as compared with the much higher price it will pay the transportation company. At the same time, the enormous outlay and the tax that would seem to render this plan so to make it an impossibility, but upon reflection it will be manifest that the plan is not alone practicable, but will be efficient in its results as to mark a definite step in the progress of our American civil-

"I shall be able to substantiate my plan in so plain a manner as not to be misunderstood; for time is too valuable to be wasted on the chimerical. But time is well spent in patient endeavor to make plain a plan in which no other is of higher rank in the country's development."

"This nation to transport farm products at a uniform postal rate, equal for any distance, allowing reasons:

"About half of our field products are These staples are sold at the London market on exchange prices; and this, for which is exported and for that which is domestic. The prices fixed in the foreign markets are based upon the lowest price of

labor in India, China, Russia, and other cheap labor countries. The farmers of our country are compelled to pay the highest price for labor anywhere in the world, hence the competition must tend to a degrading level. To overcome this tendency, I propose to rebate the transportation charges to the producer, which rebate is to be to the producer what the tariff is to the manufacturer."

"Second: If our exports equal our imports, it is evident that the producer of staples is entitled to receive back a very large slice of 'protection.' But, while he pays full price for 'protection,' he receives back none of its benefits; he is not protected, but pays just the same. As this continues, the producer is robbed of rights, of means, of strength of soil, of progress, and eventually of a livelihood. His decline is not only a loss to him, but to his locality, to the state in which he lives, his section of the country, and to the nation."

"Besides this, it falls heaviest on labor in the manufacturing centers, for the producer's lack of means prevents him from purchasing the useful as he ought, and the ornamental seldom or not at all. For the 'boss' of labor is not truly the man that hires, but it is the general condition permeating any locality. If the creek is dry, there can be no irrigation, and does not the quicksand of a one-sided protection dry up the purchasing fountain in the shape of the farmers' empty pockets? Are we not wastefully diverting the stream by wrongfully and destructively tampering with its source?"

"The remedy is then clear. Either remove the burdensome load of protection, or make it equitable by an equivalent. And as no tariff can protect the producer, the rebate on transportation can."

"But it will cost much? So it will, but does it not cost the producer much now? To be sure it does; and just because protection is forced upon him, does that make it just? Certainly not. And when New England manufacturers make loud boasts of their patriotism, but keep a sharp business eye on 'protection,' may this patriotism not be called into question by its closeness to their self interest? Does not disinterested patriotism seek the highest good for the country as a whole? Or, do we understand it to mean 'every man for his own pocket?'"

"Third: We are now to consider the cost in taxation of product shipment by the Post Office Department. Yes, the cost in taxes will be enormous, but unless it were there would not be much for the producer to gain. This need not deter us from proceeding, but let us ascertain upon whom will fall this enormous tax. Upon all, true; but upon some the greater. And in this 'some' we will find a convenient back to lay on this enormous burden; a back that is fat and strong; a back that never did carry the weight it should have; a back that has shirked, that has not earned, that casts a gloomy shadow in our republican land. In fact, it is a back that should be broken, and this system that I am advocating, if adopted, will break that back."

"This back is none other than the speculative landlord. He, and none other, can and will, if permitted, destroy our free institutions. This

is the factor that will, if permitted, make this country a new Ireland, with tenants galore, and set imperceptible tendencies at work that must ultimately rob us of our hard-earned freedom and ultimately bring the abhorred crown and scepter of the tyrant.

Yes, this creator of the proletariat, this greedy, heartless cormorant, this dangerous and insidious foe to liberty, on him will fall almost all of the enormous burden, and when he is crushed to earth, then will spring from his carcass hundreds of great cities, and innumerable villages, and millions of happy homes.

How may this be done? You will note in my original article I said that, in addition to the law authorizing the Post Office Department to carry farm products to any distance at a uniform rate, that I also said that a law should be passed that all lands owned and cultivated by American citizens *shall not be taxed*, but that all lands owned by aliens, or lands worked by renters, shall be taxed.

The advantage to the citizen working his own land without a tax will be that no alien or renter will be able to compete with him, for the difference between the untaxed and taxed lands will be much greater than now. It will not alone be the additional tax that will be added to the taxed land, from which the former taxed land was taken, but the great tax required to pay back to the government the difference caused by forwarding farm products by the Post Office Department.

This will render the renting system unprofitable, and thus, in time, abandoned. Thus, profitable farming by American citizens will give to this country that stable element, so essential to its perpetuity, as will render our experiment of a centuries' existence as a free people, but a stepping-stone to ultimate progress. And its tendency will be in the line indicated, not alone for our republic, but for the world.

The concluding lines of your criticism read:

"Plans for great reforms are not necessarily bad things in themselves, but it will be just as well not to cut loose from common justice in framing them. The only way to make them sensible is to make them just."

I hope, Mr. Editor, that you have now come to the conclusion that I have not "cut loose from common justice," and that I have endeavored to be "just." D. LUBIN.

The Bradford "Argus" (Towanda, Pa.), E. Ashmun Parsons, publisher, gives it as his opinion "the business needs of the country will at last crystalize all transportation schemes into what is for the best interests of mankind."

Are we then to understand that the affairs of man run on in a determinate course in the direction of progress, and that any attempt at an impulsive tendency is unnecessary? Then were the Athenians correct when they condemned Socrates as a "pestilential fellow" worthy of death; and then were all persecutors right, and sage, prophet, reformer, and inventor were those whose time was wasted in the idle accomplishments of that which the needs of their country would at last have crystalized into these modes calculated "for the best interests of mankind?" And were your

opinion correct it would remove the the "editorial" in newspapers, and many things deemed promotive factors. Now, Mr. Editor, are we not all and those whose impulsive energy helps events to the end that the best interests kind be attained?

If you are still in doubt, let me cite instance: A certain shrewd speculator in San Francisco, realizing that the business the country (of California) requires vessels to carry the wheat of this State land, did he "crystalize a scheme of traction" into what was "for the best interests of mankind?" No, indeed; but for him, although he did not have a single sack to ship, he nevertheless bonded all the vessels in sight—not for the benefit of kind," but for himself, remember. And when a wheat-grower wishes to ship his or to sell it, he is obliged to pay to the shrewd gentleman before he is permitted so. This is peculiarly irksome, I assure you. When I think of this "crystalize" I can warm up a little; and it may be expected that because of this my own raised on my two sections of land in this county is still in the warehouse, and to remain there for how long I do not know.

Is it the wheat-grower alone that suffers from the evils of present product transportation? Certainly not. The merchant, the Eastern manufacturer and workman must then all suffer a little. When left to solution, the transportation question is apt to crystalize into schemes of what is the worst interests of mankind.

And if transportation of the farm products only concerned the farmer alone, we would be inclined to permit the farmer to proceed along with his problem as best he can. But some little reflection will bring to the conclusion that farm product transportation affects labor in every avenue whatsoever. If a fruit-grower, for instance, sends a crate of fruit to market, which costs him \$40 to produce, and receives \$100 for it, but is compelled to pay \$60 for transportation, how much is he left? Am I drawing on my imagination for this example? Come here, buy a crate and see!

Is the railroad company robbing him for the fruit is carried at as low a price as speed and distance will permit.

Distance, and distance alone, is the destroyer, and unless we wish to be destroyed, we must destroy distance. At whose expense? Yours, at every one's. You refuse? Then moment and we will see what you will in return; figure it up yourself. We have a million and a half population, and vast capacity and soil for the population of the world. No? Well, you shall see. Spain covers 191,000 square miles. California 139,000. Madrid is in the centre of Spain; and it is south of Madrid that the semi-tropic fruit begins, whereas our semi-tropic fruit begins south of the most northerly county and extends continuously to San Diego. Notwithstanding she has scarce any manufacture, and depends almost entirely on her tropic fruit belt for her maintenance, nevertheless, 17,000,000 population. Ital

size, and with a quarter the quantity of fruit belt, and with but little manufacture than Spain, has 26,000,000 in. Why, then, cannot California be the population of France?

Our millions are here, and can dispose of products, will that not add a million to New York? a half million to

Will there be a spot in the Union not be repaid over and over again for it? Does not all this seem as if some trying to lift himself by his boot? Would not others have to pay for it's prosperity?

argue this away, and we will agree." It is not a lifting of oneself up by the heels at all. It is a distribution of wealth to give that strength and stability to a country as to insure its peaceful and perpetual. For it will insure a yeomanry, a steady demand for durable food at low prices, flourishing agriculture, and the strongest, greatest country on the face of the earth.

wait for communism, socialism, or to try its hand at correcting? Had better do the correcting ourselves?

Mr. and Fruit Grower. in a communication dated Jacksonville, Fla., September 1893: "Government control of traffic on railroads, as a necessary corollary, is control of travel, then the government should practically control the railroads. It is a great task for any government to control the entire transportation of the United States."

Government does not call for government of traffic as a whole, but only for the government of farm products. It is no more so, because farm products are to be forwarded through the Postal Department that they are to be under control of government as when novels are sent that way at present time. Even the claim that my plan will entail the employment of more in the postal service, is without foundation.

It requires more time and labor to expedite a single issue of a large paper than it would the products of a county.

The mail order business of Wannamaker's, Ridley's, Jordan Marsh, Marshall Field's, Altman, or my house, and the others are a thousand fold more complicated than farm products. Where the labor now in a business is not already overruled, they can handle farm product forwarding without an additional employee.

Mail matter—like letters—the government clerks are obliged to handle every several times, but in forwarding fifty to a single destination, the railroads' employees would load and unload every day now, and at their expense.

Pennsylvania College Monthly. Gettysburg, Pa. P. M. Bickle, Dean, editor, in a communication, Sept. 28th, says: "If the principle of 'Protection' is right, your plan is right, as it is based on the same idea."

„Der Boston Telegraph.“

Montag, den 25. September 1893.

Herr D. Lubin von Sacramento, Cal., hat die Freundlichkeit gehabt, uns einen von ihm verfaßten, in der Sacramento „Record Union“ veröffentlichten Aufsatz einzusenden, welcher für einheitliche Frachttarife sämtlicher innerhalb des Gebietes der Ver. Staaten zum Versand kommenden Farmprodukte in die Schranken tritt. Mit anderen Worten: Ein Zentner Getreide, Fleisch, Butter, Käse oder irgend ein anderes landwirtschaftliches Produkt soll zum gleichen Frachttarife beispielsweise von San Francisco nach New York wie von ersterer Stadt nach einem ewigen Meilen entfernten Orte, befördert werden. Die Beförderung soll durch die Ver. Staaten-Post in der gleichen Weise erfolgen, wie jetzt durch dieselben Briefe und Zeitungen befördert werden. Die Idee ist unzweifelhaft originell, als erste Bedingung für ihre Durchführbarkeit müßten jedoch die unser großes Land nach allen Richtungen durchschneidenden Eisenbahnen vom Bunde angekauft und verwaltet werden. Daß es hierzu schließlich kommen wird, bezweifeln wir nicht im Geringsten, ob dies jedoch noch zu Lebzeiten der jetzigen Generation geschehen wird, wage dahin gestellt bleiben. In Deutschland geschieht die Paketbeförderung bekanntlich durch die Postverwaltung und zwar besteht dieselbe seit Jahren eine einheitliche Tarife für alle Punkte bis zu fünf Pfund. Die Einrichtung hat sich ganz vortrefflich bewährt und ist jedenfalls auch sehr ausdehnungsfähig. Die Realisierung von Herrn Lubin's Vorschlag liegt dem Anschein nach wenigstens noch in weitem Felde, wir leben jedoch in einer raschlebigen Zeit, welche möglicherweise den in Herrn Lubin's Vorschläge enthaltenen Kern früher zur Reife bringen wird, wie es zur Zeit den Anschein hat. Jedenfalls sind Anregungen wie die vorliegende, der Beachtung und des Nachdenkens werth.

In commenting on the above, I beg to say that my proposition does not involve government ownership of railroads. A uniformly lower rate, if even in operation to-day, while it would mitigate would not overcome the inequalities of the tariff, nor compensate for the disadvantage of distance.

The concluding portion of the *Boston Telegraph's* article would have been more vigorously hopeful had the editor taken into consideration the fact that we have here a plan which is calculated to unite the farmer of the north, south, east and west into one solid political body, and these, together with labor (whose interests herein are identical), will make an irresistible political factor, than which none stronger can be evolved. Victory must crown the efforts of right, and the path of progress must not be impeded.

The Ironton, Ohio, Register, in a communication of Sept. 27th, says: "It will be a difficult thing to do, but not impossible."

"The Daily Northwestern," Oshkosh, Wis., in an editorial review in its issue of Sept. 28th, says: "The system of taxation now in use is the result of ages of experience and is probably as nearly equitable as any that man can devise."

Had the *Northwestern* lived in Abraham's time, and been Abraham, and had his father or the King at that time flung such logic at him, only changing the words "taxation" into "religion," and "equitable" into "true," all of us in all probability at this time would still have been praying to terra cottas gods. Further on the *Northwestern* says: "If the fruit crop of California were to be handled by the government, then the fruit crop of Florida must be handled also, as well as the corn of Iowa and Nebraska, the wheat of Nebraska, the wheat of Dakota, the cotton of the South, the wool of the Western States, and all the farm products in the United States must be sent to market in the same way." You are right; this is just what my proposition calls for.

Towards the conclusion the *Northwestern* says: "It is about time our people learned that ours is not a paternal government." I beg to differ with the *Northwestern*, and ask its editor if protection to manufacture is not paternalism? If not, what is it?

Not alone is it paternalism, but it is unjust paternalism, because it enriches the manufacturer at the expense of the producer of staples.

Is this not true? And if it is true and unjust, must the injustice remain because it is ancient? But perhaps the editor is in favor of righting the wrong by free trade. Here, again, we strike a snag. Free trade would let loose several million destroyers, and after we got over the unpleasantness there would be a king. Well, let well enough alone! But we can't. "Well enough," as it is, brings granite and marble palaces for the great cities, and mortgages and ruin to the country, and that will bring a king—in a quiet way.

Washington and Jefferson did not give us a republic for peace sake, but for the sake of justice, and the sake of equitable freedom. There are no more peaceable men in the world than the fellahs and coolies, but then they are only fellahs and coolies.

The *National Advance*, Milwaukee, Wis., in an editorial review of Sept. 30th, says: "The plan will be carried out eventually, however, because it is the only practical way of transportation in a land that proposes to recognize the equality of all men. It places all on a perfectly equal basis, and wipes out distance in shipping freight."

I am afraid, Mr. Editor, you overleap the intention of the proposition. To place "all on a perfectly even footing," would place shovels and neckties on the same footing with wheat and cotton. But wheat and cotton are now taxed all they can bear (and more too) in protecting shovels and neckties, and it is intended to give wheat and cotton a portion of their tax back in the form of much lower transportation rates. This is not so much an endeavor to cheapen as to equalize, for an even cheap rate, in itself, would still leave us inequality and injustice.

CHICAGO, Sept. 28

MR. DAVID LUBIN, DEAR SIR: You the opinion of the *Chicago Herald* re your proposal that farm products be all distances at uniform rates, the mail matter, the national government troling the business and bearing the suming that it would not pay.

It is the opinion of the *Herald* t scheme is impracticable, and that ewere practicable it would be most uenlarge the functions of the governproposed. The government is exercisternal functions altogether too much r is the opinion of the *Herald* that the should managetheir own business, and government should limit its activities, business is concerned, to the administjustice.

Yours truly,

H. R. SMITH, for the *H*

If this proposition is not "practicus we see the practicability of the *Herak* tion.

If the government is to cease exercisternal functions it must open its port world, and with one stroke remove tective tariff. And as long as China, India and Egypt can supply an ur number of work people at from two cents a day, and the rest of the world five cents to one dollar a day, what law *Herald* point to that will give the A workman a higher wage as soon as t tective tariff is removed? Absolutely n

Will he say, "we have machinery and Well, the Chinaman has demonstrated too, can use machinery and acquire ski

In the San Francisco shoe factories run a machine for one dollar a day—in you can hire him for five cents a day. is neither lazy nor particular, will fully begin before the stars have fad stop for his midnight bowl of rice. l Editor, we cannot do away with pro even though you call it "paternalism. because we dislike a name must we per and perpetuate an injustice? Suppose having two sons, one a spendthrift t other prudent and economical, and the children, depended on their father for s both of an even age and equally well-b the father giving them a certain allow common, the spendthrift unscrupulous unjustly appropriating to his own use quarters of the allowance. The prud on complaining to his father receives the "My son, in the concrete you are right. brother deprives you of a certain pro necessary for your well-being; but in struct he is right, for being by nature a thrift his nature craves for more th natural share. Shall I then attempt to with the law of nature? Far be it from do this evil. Let nature take its cours your misfortunes with resignation." ask the *Herald* to apply this parable to t governing protection in operation Have we a parallel or not? If we have, t not the producers of staples being rob protection as surely as the prudent so Answer!

ou also argue over the evil as did the evil of the spendthrift's acts?

t the prudent son teach the spendson? If not with argument, why not et of wood? In the proposition under ion, however, a paper ballot will do.

Milwaukee, in an editorial review position, says: "In Great Britain the t has been in successful operation for s and has proved such a boon to the t it would be impossible now to disit. Persons living in London and cities, owning places in the country, eir vegetables, fruit, butter, and eggs e parcel post, thereby tending to dise wealth more evenly through the In winter, English drawing rooms bright by baskets of flowers that Nice and elsewhere in the south of th punctuality and dispatch, on the is that convey the mails at almost cheap uniform rate.

zraph lines in most European counoperated by the respective governuniform rate for any message sent ir own country. In the Australian here the railways are state property, nearly all the land outside the large is been repeatedly proposed to adopt rate for the conveyance of passenagricultural produce—one journey, rm fare regardless of the distance There appears to be no reason why should not assist agriculturists to a factory and less expensive means of tion for their products than now I we advise those interested to supabin in his efforts in that direction.

Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa, Sept. In answer to yours of 22d, asking inion on your proposition to put pments under like conditions to that n the Post Office Department, is a land yet we believe practicable. Not it we believe it would tend largely to rdens, and to distribute life's blessmuch more equitable to all the inof the land. As to land exemptions, gree with you up to a limited number occupied by any one family, but inthe exemption of improvements on occupied by actual owners and also ants occupy. We are not in favor of one for improving anything—rather opportunities bear the tax and let t go free. But at the same time, as se, let us discriminate in favor of the upant. You are working toward itions. The people are thinking as ore, and out of it all will come a ilization.

rsh, Editor Towanda, Pa., Reporter in a communication Sept. 29, 1893, ur schemes for untaxed farms and tribution by the government on a asis, with no discrimination for dised, is ingenious, but I cannot believe icable." t?

"The News," Scranton, Pa., in its issue of October 1st, in an editorial review, says: "In fact Mr. Lubin thinks that the government mail service should give the festive granger the same opportunities that are afforded the book-publisher and dry goods dealer. This point seems to be well taken. There is no reason why a branch to the postal service for the handling of produce should not be established. The fruit-raiser is certainly entitled to the same benefits at the hands of Uncle Sam that are accorded the publishers of lurid fiction and the metropolitan dry goods houses that flood the country with novels, catalogues, and merchandise generally, through the mails."

I take exception to the word "festive." If *The News* would send a reporter out west to interview the producers he would find it very difficult to discover festivity around about. Perhaps mortgages and unpaid interest may create "festive" spirits east; it does not here.

The Pittsburg, Pa., Press, in a review of the proposition, closes its article thus: "Without these equalizing methods there could be no more real equality under the Lubin plan than under the present system of each man doing the best he can for himself—the only guarantee of human progress."

The *Press*, perhaps, intended to say "with" instead of "without" in the beginning of the sentence. Each man being permitted to do the best he can is liberty. Now, let the *Press* answer how the producer of staples is permitted to do his best. Is paying for protection and receiving no benefit the best he can do? Does not the law compel him to do worse than he could do? Is this liberty?

Give back to staple production what it unjustly pays for protection, and you will but do him justice, and this is "the only guarantee of human progress." My proposition will do this.

Galen Oderkirk (formerly editor of the "**Industrial Farmer and Fireside**," Toledo, Ohio), in a communication, says: "I am heartily in favor of it. I am now engaged in the practice of medicine instead of the newspaper above named, which I sold to be united with the *Toledo Weekly Blade*. I reside in Lansing, Michigan. A large percentage of the Wolverines will favor such a movement. It would be the grand thing to do for the relief of farmers. Whatever aids farmers, of course blesses all of us, and I am glad you have originated this proposition. Anything I can do to extend its influence and obtain legislation necessary to render it feasible I will gladly undertake.

C. M. Newton, Publisher of the Textile Manufacturers' Labor Weekly, Woonsocket, R. I., in a communication Sept. 27, '93, says: "Yours 21st at hand. That is a novel proposition of yours to move farm products as mail matter. It would most certainly benefit western farmers and New England consumers."

V. A. Lotier, Editor of the National Record, Danville, Pa., in a communication Sept. 29, 1893, says: "As a Populist, I indorse, in a great measure, your proposition."

Professor A. O. Reiter, editor of the "**College Student**," of Franklin and Marshall Colleges, Lancaster, Pa., in a communication dated September 28th, says: "I do not agree with you that agriculture is the basic foundation of lasting material prosperity. There was a day when that was the case, when farm products constituted the medium of exchange, and the products of the farm supplied all the wants of man. But that is centuries ago. To-day the basis of development is *labor*. Not farm labor, not labor expended in manufacture or the mechanic arts, not mental labor, but labor in all its departments. This being the case, I can see no reason why the farmer should have any special legislation any more than any other class."

Dealing with labor in the abstract you are right, but in the concrete you are wrong. The original source of wealth is the soil, or rather its products. The means of livelihood or the profit of an agricultural nation can be no greater than the volume and value of its products.

A manufacturing center may be established in the Sahara desert, and under it may flourish the arts and literature, provided they have a ready and profitable market for their manufactures. Not a blade of grass need be raised, and yet food may be plenty, as long as the demand for the manufacture lasts.

This nation, however, uses for its exchange with foreign nations her products, and not manufacture. And whenever the original producer receives a net return so meagre as to cause extreme caution in its expenditure, then he cannot afford to buy as many useful goods (and certainly none of the ornamental) as he otherwise would did his condition permit.

Now what is goods but labor?

When you thus limit his purchasing power you limit the sales of the merchant, and the merchant is compelled in turn to limit his orders. This curtails manufacture and wage earners are idle, and when this happens it affects the laborer, the editor, the minister and the butcher alike.

The cause of advance or decline having its rise in agriculture makes "agriculture the basic foundation of lasting material prosperity" just as long as we will export agricultural products and import manufactures. Therefore the proposition to ameliorate the condition of the producer is a proposition to ameliorate the conditions of all. It is progress.

E. B. Reed of "**The Black Hills Union**," in a communication, says: "The basis of your argument is sound. Material prosperity is an essential element of true progress, and agriculture is the basic foundation of lasting material prosperity. Your deduction is equally true, that it should receive prime consideration in legislative action conducive to its successful prosecution is apparent, but in reality we find other and less important interests much more carefully fostered."

The concluding portions of the communication suggest amendments and offer some objections, which are considered elsewhere in this pamphlet.

"**Virginische Zeitung**" of Richmond, October 1st: "To cover these additional expenses of our government for the benefit of farmers would compel a levy of tax against their fellow-citizens, who are fortunate enough to belong to the agricultural class."

You are right, Mr. Editor, but only to a limited extent. The unfortunates pay taxes anyway, and yet this proposition calculated to benefit them most.

The tax under consideration is not levied on those who are fortunate enough to belong to the agricultural class. It means a distribution of wealth in the country calculated to enhance the price of agricultural products, thus creating a steady demand for it.

The *Virginische Zeitung* will not do with me when I say that the manufacturer is not so much of a "boss" as he is a labor agent.

Whenever he has an order his work is done, and this is called work. Whenever an order comes, then the manufacturer is busy for workmen, and labor is idle. What is the cause of the order?

The merchant has a demand, and he must get it, let us say, comes from the city. The city people, from whom do the goods come? The means to supply that demand? The country people. Where do the goods come from? Where, if not from the net return of their products?

Now, if these net returns be so small as to prevent necessary expenditure, who is to supply the laborer? But we have manufactures for labor, have we not? Yes, means, but not a source, and we need have as long as our exports are agricultural. We will have as soon as we export manufactures.

But why subsidize agriculture at the expense of manufacture? Because manufacture is subsidized at the expense of agriculture, the protective tariff, and because the subsidizing of agriculture at the expense of manufacture will equalize what is now unequal. And as inequality is injustice, we cannot be unjust if we wish to be moral. And if we take from agriculture a portion of her just share, we rob her of that just due; we destroy liberty.

Thus we find that the proposition to subsidize agriculture upholds political honor, the highest standard, material prosperity, and it solves the problem of poverty.

The "**Devils Lake Inter-ocean**" (Dakota) in its issue September 30th, says: "A Californian has evolved a novel idea in regard to transportation of farm products. He proposes that the government should handle this class of goods, and, as is now the case with mail, transport it all distances for a uniform rate. His idea has the merit of originality, a plan was adopted it would no doubt much benefit California agriculturists."

And Dakota agriculturists, too, friends of Massachusetts manufacturers, of New York workingmen, and Connecticut men, and Ohio doctors. Will it not benefit everyone?

editor of "The Dry Goods Chronicle," work, in a communication dated September 1888, says: "From where the article begins; of concrete facts and deductions there, I think it extremely well expressed, very forcible and convincing, and it is admirable for the meeting favor with the farming to whom you address it."

Dr DeBerard mistakes my intention when I say that I addressed my article to the farming classes. The proposition is for the consideration not alone by farmers, but by manufacturers, merchants, and those of the professions. In my fellow-citizens in every walk of life in every section of our country.

I dissent further on the editor says: "But I dissent from the deductions of the article, believing as I do that it is based on false premises. Your main premise is that countries having cheap labor will control the industries into which that cheap labor is introduced and drive from the race all countries having high-priced labor in similar industries. Experience proves the contrary."

I do not differ with the editor. I could easily state that my premise is not false, but I stick to its truth that there is no proposition certain of demonstration. Take the experience of Chinese labor in California, for instance. Were there no check to its descent, then by this time the editor would have been wearing a "Stetson" hat made by Chinamen, a Troy shirt made and laundered by Chinamen, and, if he smokes, a Havana cigar by Chinamen; the type of his paper has been set by Chinamen; his house is full of Chinamen. And, our ports open to China, free and without any duty, for, say, 20 years, there would not, at the end of five years, be a single factory of importance within the United States. The greater absorption of our labor in China than in California would be by reason of a wage of ten cents a day for Chinese labor in China, and a dollar for a Chinaman in California. Machine-Experience has proven that, while the Chinaman is not an inventor, he soon learns to use a machine as successfully as any one

case of economics would have our work done at the cheapest rate, in order to get back in the line of least resistance in the world. But these economists forget that this would bring us a king, and place us on a par with China. This the free-trade economists and point to the fact that the much higher price for commodities, even though the price were lower than to-day, would buy more than now; hence a greater degree of comfort would follow. In reply, we may say that there would be no comfort, but there would be a lution of blood, and from out of chaos emerge the iron rod of the tyrant. We receive a higher wage and pay a higher price where, then, is our profit? Our profit in England is partly due to the fact that a larger portion of our population are not allowed to pay rent, that there are a much larger number of land owners here; that we are not burdened, like England, with an enormous

national debt. We pay no expenses for queens, or kings, or lords, or a gigantic navy.

Our saving over Russia consists in our not having four million soldiers to feed and equip, and that we have no czar, or nation-consuming bureaucracy. We talk of high taxation; we really do not know what it means. In Vienna, in 1888, U. S. Consul Edmund Jusson informed me that the tax in that city was 30 per cent. And when we pay a wage of \$2 a day, we really pay \$1 a day for labor, and \$1 saving on taxes, and this we manage to do by the aid of the protective tariff. But were the tariff removed, the dollar for wages only would be paid, and the other dollar would go for soldiers to keep in subjection those of us who would wish to return to present conditions. The editor of the *Chronicle* may, of course, cite cases where American manufacture at high wages can yet compete with success against lower wage countries, and can give as examples, Waterbury watches, sewing machines, clocks, etc., which are exported and sold at a lower price than in the United States. Granted; but all this is trifling when compared to the vast volume that we cannot compete with, which even a hasty glance at the amount of our tariff revenue will show. And even the insignificant total with which we at the present moment compete may shortly be reduced, and totally so as soon as our machines have been imitated.

It therefore follows that my premises are correct; that "countries having cheap labor will control all industries into which that cheap labor enters, and drive from the race all countries employing high-priced labor in similar industries." And to counteract this tendency, a protective tariff is absolutely necessary.

Now, this very cheap labor of India, Asia Minor, Egypt, North Africa and Russia is the very thing that is driving our staple farm producers down to a degrading level, and this industry must in time utterly perish, or drag the wage-earning rate of all down to a degrading level. And in order to avert this, it is absolutely necessary to either abandon the raising of staple products, or to protect it. A tariff cannot do so, for it is not here a question of imports, but of exports. I therefore offer as a substitute mode of protection the postal system of forwarding farm products, practically allowing farm products its cost for transportation to its ultimate market, deeming this a sufficient check against the cheaper labor of foreign countries. The postal rate for farm products to be fixed at so low a rate as to make the cost but an infinitesimal factor.

This postal carriage of farm product, will it not involve the expenditure of an enormous amount by the government, which will entail increased taxation, and which in turn will bring a reduction of wages?

Is not this postal carriage of farm products an attempt at lifting oneself up by the bootstraps?

Yes, the expenditure will be vast, but it will not be a lifting one's self up by the bootstraps. It will be true progress, as I shall show.

The revenue required can be raised on import duty, and on internal revenue, and this tax is an indirect one, and as our pension list

will be growing smaller with time, our present appropriations for that purpose may presently be sufficient in itself (or nearly so) to cover the requirements.

The gain of the postal farm product system to the nation will be much greater than any necessary outlay, however; for, in the first place, it will remove all tendency of value fluctuations now so disastrously manifested at every change of an administration. Protection once established on an equitable basis, there would be no counteracting tendency of a free-trade party. And this factor once removed, there would be far less sectional friction, removing at the same time one of the principal causes of race hatred down south.

The provision of a greater net return to the producer would place at the initial source an available fund for the merchant, who would make use of it in supplying himself with additional merchandise. In other words, there would be a demand for more goods, hence for more labor of every description. It will also do away with the long-standing injustice of compelling the producer of staples to sell his wheat or cotton at Liverpool (India) prices, and compelling him to buy his shovel, his hat, or boots, at the American protective tariff prices.

I hope, Mr. Editor, that I have shown that my premises were not false, that they are correct, and that the remedy I propose will bring that state of equilibrium essential to the welfare and perpetuity of our republic.

"*Evening Wisconsin*" of Sept. 30th: "*The Wisconsin* thinks it is a populist nonsense."

If the aim of "populist nonsense" is to bring about conditions which will increase the net earnings to the producer, to increase the demand for labor, to cheapen the cost of food to the consumer, to eliminate the cause for race hatred down South, to give increased business to the manufacturer, and to make his outstanding accounts securer—then the quicker the "populist nonsense" becomes a reality the better.

Is it not barely possible, however, that the *Evening Wisconsin* is mistaken in his bearing? The Populists want a host of things; for instance, women's rights, government railroads, free silver, greenbacks, in fact, a host of things, whereas the proposer of this proposition is—like the *Evening Wisconsin*—an ordinary straight Republican, but we seem to differ in this: I want protection, equal and just to the Massachusetts manufacturer and to the Louisiana planter. Now, as a good Republican the *Evening Wisconsin* agrees with me as to protection in so far as the Massachusetts manufacturer is concerned, but when we talk of doing the same thing for the Louisiana planter, he seems to sneer and mock with his "populist nonsense."

The editor is politically self-possessed, and this may be through the result of repeated Republican victories, some of which were gained but with slight effort. But, sir, for the sake of argument, if you were asked the question, "Will the proposition herein advocated be favorably received by the farmers?" you would certainly answer "Yes, for they have nothing to lose by it and everything to gain." Again,

"Will it be acceptable to the west?" "Yes, for the same reason." Now farmers and workingmen consent every other question, but agree to proposition here advocated alone. Likely they will—what then? Will the union be sufficient to carry the measure, it will.

You have here no "populist nonsense," but a demand for long-delivered justice. Is this not so?

"*The Port Huron (Mich.) Times*" closes his review with: "The editor (the proposition) at the present time not bring about any good results."

I fail to see why the "present time" is not good as any other. Does the editor object because of the great multitude employed at the present time throughout the country, it is unsafe to discuss wrongs and how to correct them?

If we fail in suggestions that may be made, may we not expect the Socialist, the Communist and the Anarchist to gesting for us? Were we living in the twentieth century, we could wait for the time to find us an equilibrium. But we are toward the close of the nineteenth century when the proletariat can write, can think, and when opportunity can do much mischief. And the present is certainly not be unmerited, if we are in supposed security and quietude at an opportune time when we may be getting a better way than the present. My brother's keeper," said Cain, and I do not expect "our brother" to be our less we remove the barrier to his progress. Do not think, Mr. Editor, that the above is an agitator, or an Anarchist, or a Socialist. My daily occupation is as a merchant, employing several hundred men and in politics I am a Republican. I write because I wish my name in the paper. I have it in several papers 365 days a year and the novelty has worn off. I believe I have a truth to impart to the betterment of my fellow-citizens, and of my country, and I believe that the solution of my proposition at this time will bring about good results. And you will agree with me when you give my proposition further investigation.

The *Deadwood "Independent,"* S. D., in a communication, Sept. 10th, says: "I believe your proposition goes to the heart of the problem of the distressed wealth. It is eminently just for the farmer. By our vicious land laws millions of acres have been driven so far from the market that they cannot make their products practically pay for them, owing to the great cost of transportation. What could be more just than that the government should reimburse them for their products to market at the same price as the more favored ones who have possession of land nearer the great centers? It would put them nearer on an equal footing with their competitors and recompense them for being driven so far from the great centers."

Palladium" (Benton Harbor, issue October 4th, says: "David of Sacramento, Cal., proposes paying by having the governmental products to market as now transported—at so much a cost of distance. His theory is an arrangement farm products in the prairies of the interior as upon land adjacent to the seacoast it would cost no more to ship wheat in Kansas, or Texas, than in New York. He would place them in the hands of the government at the lowest possible rates, as an inducement to the farmer. His scheme has the merit of extreme novelty, whether or not."

of the *Palladium*, in addition to its communication says: "Somebody done to attract men toward it to drive them from it. Permitted upon an expedient that may be. I hope you have."

an **Israelite**, Cincinnati, Ohio, Oct. 5th, says:

Lubin, of Sacramento, in a long written paper in the *Record* contends that as a sure foundation of prosperity and for the equalization of all farm lands, farm products be national government as mail uniform rate for all distances, no doubt be an excellent thing, if it were possible to bring it, it would affect all other classes is on."

On other question, Mr. Editor, farmer is benefited—as you have will be—then the store-keeper benefited by selling more goods, which additional orders to the manufacturer employs additional work people. Are not all benefited?

editor of the **McKeesport "Daily Express"** (Pa.), in a communication 1893, says: "There is no longer that the farmer should be protected, but should be some means provided for products could be transported at moderate cost. As to the feasibility of farm product on the same basis, and have it transported on the line of railroad on the same system of the country, is worthy of consideration, and I would not feel like introducing a scheme until I had given it consideration."

as to the tax being removed from land owned and worked by Americans to be in the right direction, would seem to me that such a road tax could hardly be abolished, but I would be glad to see it abolished."

I consider your article novel, and of careful consideration."

"Messenger" (Mich.), October 1893, says: "The plan could be made practical, and it is far better than the present transportation rates."

The editor of **"The Crawford Journal,"** Meadville, Pa., says: "I am in favor of persevering until we find some plan which will make agriculture profitable to those who are industrious, intelligent, and manifest the same care and ability in conducting their affairs that men who succeed in other business do in theirs."

I am afraid, Mr. Editor, that you have pointed out an impossible task. That would be paternalism with a vengeance. The protective tariff, for instance, does it only protect "industrious and intelligent" manufacturers, or does it simply protect manufacture? The latter, clearly. And for the same reason it is just to protect agriculture as well, which you must admit (if you would be just) has an equal right to protection."

As to the plan, it is here, and we should persevere; or it is not, then why not?

The Bradford (Pa.) "Daily Era," in an editorial review of the proposition, says: "Of course if book transportation by the government at a loss is justifiable, then Mr. Lubin is correct."

No, Mr. Editor, the "book transportation" is not a parallel case. The forwarding or the non-forwarding of books involves no principle of justice, but the forwarding of staple farm products to their ultimate market does."

For it is intended by this means to pay back a portion of the loss sustained by the producer of staples for protection, which he receives no value for now."

The Era further says: "Granted the application to land products, and why not carry it onward to everything that administrators to the comfort or luxury of mankind?"

Because everything produced "that administrators to the comfort and luxury of mankind" is protected, but staple agricultural production has to pay the bill for protection out of its meager Liverpool price. Hence palaces reward luxury-producers, and mortgages are the penalty for yeomanry."

Justice, Mr. Editor, justice alone must prevail, if we are to continue to be a free people."

The editor of **"The Post,"** Waupaca, Wis., in referring to my proposition, says: "Whenever a man sticks up for what he believes to be right, he is entitled to consideration and respect."

Just so, Mr. Editor. Now I hope that further consideration will cause you to believe in the righteousness of this proposition, and that when you will believe in it that you will stick to it, and then, Mr. Editor, there will be additional reason why you will be entitled to consideration and respect."

Providence "Journal of Commerce" (Providence, R. I.), Sept. 29, 1893: J. D. Hall, editor, in a communication says: "I have read with intense interest the article headed 'A Novel Proposition,' and I believe it possible to develop such a system of freighting agricultural products under control of the government, the price to be uniform for any distance within the United States. The columns of my journal will always be open to articles favoring this new movement."

From a Communication from the "Tribune" Publishing Company, Greensburg, Pa.: The facts pertaining to the agriculturist, that you note, must strike every one who cares to examine the matter as being forcible, but as to the feasibility of the proposed remedy we are not so sure. The transportation question is one of great moment, and any one who takes pains to enlighten the people thereon is a benefactor. The proposition is a novel one, to be sure, but may prove to be "the beginning of the end" of a plan to elevate the farmer, and equalize the heritage of God to man on his precious footstool. The farmers must assert themselves. More anon. Truly yours,

E. F. HOUSEMAN, Editor.

The Marysville "Democrat," in its issue of September 18th, in an editorial review of my proposition, as set forth in the *Record-Union* September 14th, seems to think that I made an argument for protection, but the *Democrat* failed to state what kind of protection. Now, Mr. Editor, I am not in favor of protection, nor of free trade, as it is to-day. What I am in favor of, however, is that equitable protection which will not alone bring fortune to the manufacturer, but do so without robbery to the producer.

"The Gazette and Chronicle," Pawtucket, B. I., Sept. 28th, says: "Your ideas are morally good; the only trouble seems to be their present impracticability. But no reform comes in a day or night, and you are entitled to hope for the future. There is no doubt that the necessities of life distributed in the manner you propose would do much more good than the present government system of distributing trash literature. Push the matter and get the press of the country to assist."

Mr. Geo. U. Harn, editor of **"The Daily Herald,"** Mansfield, O., September 30, 1893, says: "Your thoughts are novel and worthy the profound attention of the people. If you accomplish nothing more, you have succeeded in causing further discussion of the subjects uppermost at present; and free and general debate never fails to bring forth results best for the whole people."

"Southern Agriculturist," Montgomery, Ala.—Editor Thos. J. Key's letter says: "To carry the farm products long distances for the same price of short distances (as the general government will carry you this letter 2,000 miles, and yet charge the same as if it goes only 10 miles), is novel, and one that must be thoroughly investigated."

Says the Editor of the "Herald" (Sheboygan, Wis.): "Boil your article down to a stickful and we will read it; otherwise life is too short. I rather think it is a good idea, or at least to a certain extent, from reading a few lines."

I would like to accommodate you, Mr. Editor, if I could. Select a "stickful" from this pamphlet, and let me have your opinion for or against in time for next month's edition of 30,000.

Rufus J. Foster of the Colliery Enquirer, Scranton, Pa., in a communication 1893, says: "Your proposition for the tation of farm products is certainly one, but I cannot see why the same should not be given the products of the coal and metal mines of the country, and if given to them why it should be extended to the manufacturing establishments. The reason why the same facilities should not be given to the 'products of the coal and metal mines of the country, manufactures' is plain. These are products of the farm products are not."

The "Morning Olympian Tribune," in its editorial review of the Postal Carriage for products, Sept. 23d, is of the opinion that government ownership of railroad would solve the problem. Would it? It would equalize the burden of protection? If government ownership of railroads were a substitute for the proposition, but I question and is in itself foreign in its conclusion from the issue.

Milford N. Ritter, publisher of Weekly News, Reading, Pa., in a communication, Sept. 29th, says: "I have read your article with great interest. Your proposition seems to be practical, and I can see no objection to their adoption. The fact is more in need of legislative aid than other class."

The New York Tribune, in a communication, Sept. 27, 1893, says: "Your favor of instant, has been received. It will be to the attention of Mr. Nicholson, our Managing Editor, upon his return from his week or ten days hence."

A. J. Hazlett, editor of "The News-Herald," O., in a communication, Sept. 28, says: "Your clipping from *Record-Union* of your article came duly to hand. I have lighted with it and shall take the liberty of publishing extracts from the same and you marked copies."

"The Times" (McKeesport, Pa.), in its issue of October 2d, gave a lengthy synopsis of the editorial columns of the proposition.

The editor of the ***Evening Clipper*** (Spartanburg, S. C.), in a communication, favors the proposition.

The question has been asked, will not an increase of production of staple products in this country lower the export price? Little to fear on that score, for, vast as the territory is, it is hardly a factor when compared with the rest of the world. The price is likely to decline whenever rent and wages decline in the cheap labor countries.

Quite a number of clippings and communications are omitted from this issue for want of space. They will appear in the next issue.

Distance Competition.

several replies to criticisms, I have, I given ample reasons why the products should receive the benefits of the difference between present rates of transportation and the much lower rates should they be carried by the U. S. Post Office Department; I have shown that this lower rate is to them what the tariff is to the manu-

now proceed to show why farm products of a non-staple character should also be treated the same way, and will give California an example:

be understood right here that I do not mean California on theory, but from twenty years of practical experience. When the first apples were marketed here there was a minimum quantity, and they brought a high price; but as there came an average supply, and the price was lowered; after that came the maximum, and there was a glut and consequent loss to overcome the loss the maximum was reached at \$800 per car. A minimum was reached, the price was high; as the supply increased and the price lowered; enough, however, to encourage additional production, until a maximum was reached, and then that time came there was a loss.

The railroad company was petitioned to lower the rates, which they did to \$650 per car. The same experience precisely was repeated as before, until the loss became serious as to be almost classed as a calamity. The railroad was again petitioned, and was ordered to work a rate of \$400 per car was

And to-day California has again the same, again down to a loss.

The railroad company, however, now says it will be useless to petition again, claiming the rates are now as low as the company can profitably carry this product. Now, in the name of the company's sake, if we take the company's word, granted, what condition have we reached? What but retrogression? California, in this condition, must not alone remain stationary, she must do more. To save the sufficient number of trees and vines grubbed out, so as to reach the average, a profit may be realized.

Now, however, that the railroad continues the price again say to \$300 a car from present indications it is not doing—the result will be the same as before—the ultimate day of reckoning must come to California just where she is to-day.

In the condition of arrested progress must go such time as the great hindrance is, and that hindrance is the great cost of transportation. Even government owned railroads (if run on cost) may reduce but may not be enough to effect a remedy. The only remedy is to eliminate the ratio rate for distance, in farm products pointed out before. In other words, government transport farm products through its Post Office Department, paying transportation companies the ruling rates, giving the shipper a minimum rate of

this system be just to New York or Maryland? Can these states afford to be ordered to have California reap the ben-

efit? Certainly they can, because they will more than make it up on the vastly increased orders for manufactured goods likely to follow from increased prosperity. At the same time, almost as much of the benefit derived through the postal product system will inure to the greater number of producers in those much older states. Will not the vastly increased volume of production of the west going east, make the eastern producer's product so low as to render their productions unprofitable? No, for even if the price is lower, they too will save on the cost of transportation; and, in the majority of instances, there is scarce any interference, because the fruits and vegetables of the several sections mature at different times.

The real gainer would be the consumer, in buying at a lower price, and the producer, in receiving a higher net return. And the proportion of extra tax on the manufacturer would be more than offset by his greater volume of business, and greater security of his outstanding accounts, by reason of the steady prosperity.

Labor would be the greatest gainer in the steady and upward tendency of labor values, and in the greater demand for higher priced goods, requiring skilled workmen.

Should the tax even then be high, then even that can easily be remedied by taxing such wealth as is not productive, at a higher rate than now, and in a more rigorous vigilance in compelling present tax shirkers to make true returns of their taxable property. And there are ample means to bring this about, as, for example, the showing of the ledger, the amount of fire insurance carried, the commercial agency's rating, and the swearing in of the principals publicly in a court of justice.

In the case of bond or mortgage holders, or those having large personal property, in addition to the above, the estate in passing through probate, if larger than when given in during life, should be held for back taxes, and treated the same as smuggled goods at the custom house.

Tyranny? No. Honest men will not object to it; for the others, who cares?

Those of a conservative mind will no doubt object to the entire proposition, and cry "innovation," or "novelty," or "theory." Let them now answer me what other method they can offer for the removal of the great hindrance to progress?

If they say "progress will make a way for itself without artificial aids," then I will ask them, is not the protective tariff an artificial aid? Is not government itself an artificial aid? Is not the great social organization under which we live an artificial aid?

Remove artificial aid and we have savagery, as it is in Patagonia.

My intention, however, is not to quarrel with men of conservative mind, realizing that if once convinced that we have here the truth, they will at least offer no resistance to progress. And, perchance, the truth may so animate them with its high possibilities that they may become ardent advocates. And one ardent conservative can often make more converts than many enthusiasts.

This subject is not, however, to be dismissed

with a wise wink, a significant shrug, or an unthinkable metaphor. California is here, ready for her thirty million inhabitants; she has thus far only a million and a half; when shall she have the rest? Clear the track; give her the right of way with her products to market, and she stands ready for her millions.

Time enough? And why? Are there no millions of poverty stricken wretches east, and west, and north, and south? Are not the conditions as they are manufacturing the proletariat at a much more rapid rate than those who may be comfortable?

Change the transportation conditions so that the rate for distance does not consume us, and you can send us all the poor in the land, and the Pacific coast will absorb them all, and more too; and when, in the course of events, you eastern people come out to look for them, you will not find them, for their poverty will have vanished, never to return, as long as the conditions outlined are in force.

Impossible? Why? Suppose the truth is here? Think. D. LEVIN.

Postal Rates on Transportation.

About a week after my original article appeared in the *Record-Union*, my attention was drawn to an article in the September number of the *Engineer's Magazine*, on "Distance and Railway Tariffs," by James L. Cowles, writer on economics. It concludes as follows:

"An ideal transportation system," says Mr. E. Porter Alexander, in his 'Railway Practice,' 'would be one in which any shipper might sit quietly in his office and contract to deliver freight at any town in the United States, by referring to a printed tariff, which should show rates as uniform as the rates of postage and not exorbitant in amount.' This ideal system is the postal system, which makes the rate for the shortest distance, for any particular service, the rate for all distances, regardless of amount of business. It is reasonable, practicable, just. Once recognized and adopted as the law of motion in our great circulating system, most of the evils of that system will vanish like the mist before the rising sun."

The ideal system of Mr. Porter, even if realized, would not bring us a step nearer the proposition of establishing the equation between the amount paid and the amount received for protection by the producers of staples. It does show, however, that thinking men's minds tend in the direction of an enlargement of the advantages of the postal system in the carriage of freight at an even rate for any distance.

The question of a general reduction of rates, however, is not near as important as the one of a just and equitable distribution of wealth. Rates may be reduced to half their present cost, and unless an equilibrium is maintained, the net results would be the same, and in some respects worse, as an instance will illustrate: Some time ago the rates from New York to San Francisco, on hats, was \$6.30, on clothing and shoes \$4.20, and on millinery \$8.40 per hundred, and business was brisk. The rates were lowered to \$1.60, and yet in spite of this heavy reduction, business is dull. What is the cause? The farmers have no money, the ruling prices for products cause a loss, and, as cost

of transportation on products is the factor in the selling price, it would follow the removal of the factor would bring to the producer.

In other words we could restore the wretched condition by advancing hats and to the previously higher rates, if it could be applied to the reduction of transportation on products, provided was enough saving to make up the cost. Such an arrangement, however, would be just, for it would tax the merchant and permit the landlord, the financial professional man, and the eastern merchants, who would supply him with a goods, to share in a prosperity at the expense of the merchant. Besides, his control power with other sections would be diminished. But when this is done by a general tax, then it is just to all. But this is financial distress, and as soon as a condition is restored, the farmer will not get along all right. He may manage along, but not all right; for nothing can help him all right until you restore the equilibrium on the tariff, which he pays for and if he receives no return. Please do not lose sight of this. In some respects the farmer is compelled to pay "all the traffic will bear is, in seasons of prosperity we graciously permit him to make a living, but when prices decline, he is allowed to go to the wall. Now if our sense of justice is blunted to such a degree that we permit this wicked sense of self-interest alone ought to tell us that this policy is destructive to the interests. Even a shrewd rogue aims to win when it pays him better than roguery. To what else, therefore, can we attribute present unequal conditions, if not to this? Must we continue this injustice if it is ancient?

A Study of the Census.

From an address before the California Board of Trade, by General N. P. Child, Red Bluff, Cal., entitled "A study of the census, showing how new population in California distributed itself between 1880 and 1900," and quote the following: "The table shows disproportionate gain in the cities and towns. The country has gained only 22.7 per cent. while the cities and towns have gained 100 per cent. Anyone familiar with the conditions existing in California will see that this is a healthy distribution of our increase."

The General might have added: "In spite of the fact that professional men were hired by land sellers and colony who scoured the emigrant boarding-houses in the eastern cities for colonists, and who were sent to Europe, seeking out and peopling the colonies to settle in this State."

The congestion of population in California alone a fact in California, but it is a fact throughout the United States; and it continues to be so until the time comes when it can be made profitable. And the only way to make it profitable is to remove the ruling factor of distance, and cost for transportation of farm products. The postal rates for farm product carriage herein advocate a solution to this question.

California State Grange.

The receipt of the following telegram is acknowledged:

PETALUMA, CAL., October 3, 1893.

LUBIN, *Sacramento, Cal.*: State Grange invites you to deliver address, Wednesday evening, at 8 o'clock. Answer.

E. W. DAVIS, Master California State Grange.

which the following is a reply:

SACRAMENTO, October 3, 1893.

W. DAVIS, Master California State Grange, *Petaluma, Cal.*: Your invitation received. Hope to be present, to bring before the Grange proposition for the permanent advancement of agricultural interests, possible and attainable. D. LUBIN.

The address was delivered in accordance with above, and was confined to the subject of postal carriage of farm products at a uniform (and nominal) rate for any distance.

Whereafter the Grange appointed a committee of five, with instructions to examine into the details of the proposition and report back to the Grange their opinion as to practicability. Not knowing that this was to have taken place, the writer was on my home at the time the committee met in session.

Monday, October 9th, the chairman of the committee handed me the following, the report of the committee, as announced by it and adopted by the State Grange:

Our committee, to whom was referred the proposition of D. Lubin, revolutionizing the distribution of wealth, farm products moved as mail matter, at a uniform rate for all distances, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report that the subject is of too great magnitude and importance to receive such examination in the brief time at our immediate disposal. We therefore ask that further time be granted and to be permitted to consider the subject, with the hope of arriving at just conclusions, and report to the executive committee of the State Grange of California after the close of this session."

Signed by

E. GREER, CHAIRMAN.

S. F. COULTER.

GEO. OHLEYER.

M. T. NOYES.

D. A. OSTROM.

Executive Committee of California State Grange, held at the city of Petaluma, Cal., 1893.

The editor of THE COMMONER AND GLASSWORKER (Pittsburg, Pa.,) in a communication dated October 2d, says: "I have always the greatest respect for the man who makes an effort to change the present inequitable conditions."

The editor of THE POMEROY DEMOCRAT (Ohio,) in a communication October 6th, "I have read your article in the RECORD-UNION very carefully, and endorse two leading ideas."

The WISCONSIN AGRICULTURIST (Racine, Wis.,) in a communication October 7th, "There is no doubt if such a plan could be made to work, it would be of great value to the farmer."

"It would be of great value to the farmer," it will be equally valuable to labor. The two elements politically united on this issue and it becomes a reality.

Editor Nicholson, of the "New York Tribune," in a communication of October 11th, in relation to this proposition, says:

"Your statement of the needs of farmers, and of the importance of their industry to the country, is eminently true and meritorious. At the same time it seems to me scarcely wise to hold out to our agricultural friends the prospect of a mode of relief through a practical control of transportation by the government."

In reply I wish to state that there need be no more "practical control of transportation by the government" should this proposition be adopted than there is at the present time. The California Fruit Union, an association of growers (through its manager), practically forwards the fruit crop of this State, yet not a member owns a single share of railroad stock, the manager's "control of transportation" being limited to the engaging of space in a car and the number of cars wanted.

Does not the United States Government now handle and forward hundreds of thousands of tons of novels, newspapers and merchandise through its Postal Department? Then why cannot the government extend the same privilege to agriculture?

If my statement of the case regarding the importance of agriculture is, as you say, "eminently true," then would it not be for the higher interests of our country for the government to forward through its Postal Department agricultural products, first of all, and then if there is room left newspapers, novels and merchandise?

Now, I have no greater feeling of reverence for a farmer, as a man, than I have for a shoemaker, but agriculture is of much greater importance than shoemaking, for if farming is rendered unprofitable, neither the shoemaker nor you, Mr. Editor, or I, could securely hold on to our respective occupations. It is but proper that the shoemaker, the editor and the merchant should aid the farmer to make his occupation profitable, and when we have succeeded we have but helped ourselves.

Further on in your letter you say that it "is not likely to be adopted within any reasonable time." No, not if the farmers are to try their hand at it alone. My observation of the political actions of the farmer leads me to believe that they operate in politics as some boys that I used to know years ago played at marbles "through the alley." The "alley" was set up, and the venturesome, reckless boy rolled a handful at a time, but the careful boy took good aim and fired one at a time. And, as a result, the careful boy generally "busted" his more venturesome mate. So with the farmer. He has not been contented to go into the field with one "issue," but he must have ten or a dozen at a time, and the invariable result has been that he is left behind by the "protection" or "tariff reform" single criers.

If, however, he has at last come to his senses, and comes forth with the single cry "protection to agriculture, as well as to industry," he stands a very good show of having this proposition adopted within a very reasonable time.

You may think that even then the farmer may not be strong enough to carry it. Yes, I think there is room enough for doubt there; but there is another element that will gladly join with him, as soon as that element will see its best interests served by doing so, and that element is labor. Labor will soon discover that this plan offers the most practical solution to

its great problem. That the adopted plan will create for it that stand which alone can maintain a maximum wages.

Labor will soon discover that the farmer is not the real "boss," but the source of work is the surplus earning farmer. That when the farmer has he can have no work.

Now, it is not at all unlikely but that two will unite, and if they do, and stick together for just one campaign one issue, they will surely win. I think so?

Well, if this is not enough, we will manufacturers, for they will certainly object to this proposition as soon as they are convinced that it will mean order cases of goods where one is ordered safer accounts than ever. If this is a we can certainly persuade the merchant "stand in," for they know right well, money ought to be in order to make.

Will not the country as a whole support this proposition is adopted? No; on the it is the very plan to adopt if we will penetrate the freedom we enjoy, and its growth to its highest possibilities.

Who will pay for the great outlay they will soon fix that. A high tariff on silks, furs, meerschaum pipes, etc., will do it.

At the conclusion of the letter is this: "The wiser course for the farmer is surely to adjust themselves to the conditions which actually exist, with such results as are practicable." Now, just as low farmer in the south keeps on paying advancing scale in the upward tender labor market there, and the virgin soil of the great west and now gone, it will not be in the farmers' power to adjust. His affairs will be as that condition known as "foreclosure" has not this sort of adjustment been at an alarming rate already? More perhaps more numerous than tombstones are of as great utility in the upbuilding republic. Extravagance? Overall, slop-bonnets are not signs of extravagance. No, the producer of staple farm products can no more compete with India, China, Russia, and live, than can the man He is being slowly but surely driven to poverty and ruin. Take a pencil, and the price of labor in the cheap labor tries, then put down what the farmer pays; then have his crop at same price; then have him buy his at protection prices, and what will be the result?

If we would annex England and that all American products would be there, we would not then need any protection. If we cannot do this, then there exists a remedy or adjustment that will give permanent relief, other than the present under consideration.

ATLANTA, GA., Oct. 1.

D. LUBIN, Sacramento, Cal.—DEAR SIR: Your proposition is a novel and plausible one. We are not prepared, however, to follow it, yet cannot help observing that the face it appears just and reasonable, I am, Respectfully,

SOUTHERN CULT

THE MARGIN OF PROFIT OF THE PRIMARY INDUSTRY (AGRICULTURE) IS THE SOURCE FOR THE
SUPPORT OF THE SECONDARY INDUSTRY (MANUFACTURE); THE VOLUME OF
THE FORMER DETERMINES THE LATTER.

NUMBER 2

—OF—

“A NOVEL PROPOSITION,”

SHOWING HOW THE RATE OF WAGES

(IN MANUFACTURING CENTERS)

—AND THE—

DEMAND FOR SKILLED LABOR

IS INFLUENCED BY THE

COST OF TRANSPORTATION ON FARM PRODUCTS.

ADVOCATING A PLAN FOR THE MORE EQUITABLE
DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

OF INTEREST ALIKE TO

AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURE, COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Containing Opinions and Criticisms of Manufacturers, Merchants, Political
Economists, Labor Leaders, Farmers and Professional Men of
the United States and Europe.

BY DAVID LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.

1894.

INDEX TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Abraham, I. J., Lakeview, Nev.	59	Hilgard, Prof. E. W., University of California	27	Popper, Max, San Francisco	1
American Federation of Labor	18	Hamilton, Rev. Wm., New York	60	Patten, W. R., Glenburn, Cal.	1
American Needle Co., New York	54	Hill, Hon. W. W., U. S. Post Office	29	Rodpath Mfg. Co., Boston, Ma.	1
Andrews Soap Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	29	Hobert, H. G., Orange, Cal.	41	Robertson Mfg. Co. (J. R.), New York	1
Ashley, Prof. W. J., Harvard University	31	Hartman, G. B., Mehama, Oregon	53	Ross, C. E., Pueblo, Colo.	1
Ayer, Prof. Lewis M., Anderson, S. C.	31	Hodges, Geo., Salada, Oregon	61	Roberts, C. E., Elmira, Cal.	1
Arnold, A. W., San de Fuca, Wash.	60	Irwin, J. W., Linden, Texas	54	"Richmond Guardian," Quebec	1
Barber & Co., Auburn, N. Y.	36	Jones, J. P., Elstunore, Cal.	52	Ryce, A. C., Fresno, Cal.	1
Barker Mfg. Co., Providence, R. I.	32	Jehery, G., Grainland, Cal.	59	Rodway, Prof. Jas., Georgetown, British Guiana	1
Bill & Caldwell, New York	38	Jones, E. W., Quebec, Canada	27	Rothschild Bros. & Co., New York	1
Bonte, Dr. J. H. C., University of California	25	Kennedy, J. C., Winters, Cal.	61	Roache, A. F., Watsonville, Cal.	1
Brooks, John S., Brooklyn, N. Y.	28	Kirby, C. M., Dixon, Cal.	52	Stuart, Mrs. M. M., Auburn, Cal.	1
Brooks, W., Mayhews, Cal.	50	Laurence, Webster & Co., manufacturers, Malone, N. Y.	39	Stohl, E. S., Springfield, Mo.	1
Colchester Rubber Co., Conn.	36	Lathrop, P. N., Salada, Oregon	61	Smith, Prof. Monroe, California College, New York	1
Douglas Shoe Co., Brockton, Mass.	38	Levy, Benj., Boston, Mass.	54	Smith, M. A., Annister, Ala.	1
Debs, E. V., Terre Haute, Ind.	23	Levi, Webster & Co., New York	62	Smith, O. M., Newcastle, Cal.	1
De Gomez, F., Auburn, Cal.	54	Lewis, Dr. D., Göttingen, Germany	33	Sparks, T. J., Coutelane, Cal.	1
Diercks, Dr. Gustave, Steglitz, Germany	26	Lilly, Bracket & Co., Brockton	27	Stevens, Mrs. C. W., San Jose	1
De Groof, H., Medford, Oregon	59	Labor	16	Scott, J. W., Santa Margarita, Cal.	1
Drew, E. C., Arcadia, La.	60	Levy, Rev. J. L., Philadelphia	31	Sweeney, F., Elmira, Cal.	1
Darlington, A., Placerville, Cal.	54	"Labor Leader," Boston, Mass.	47	Sanborn Rose Mfg. Co., New York	1
Ely, Prof. Richard T., University of Wisconsin	55	"La Nouvelle Revue," Paris, France	51	Schaeffer, Hermann, New York	1
Elzas, Rev. B. A., Sacramento, Cal.	52	Mavor, Prof., Toronto, Canada	43	Schloss & Co., N. J., New York	1
Edward Miller & Co., New York	34	McEvoy, Prof. J. M., Toronto	40	Seiz, Schwab & Co., Chicago	1
Einstein Company, Chicago, Ill.	27	Middleton, Rev. Dr. T. C., Villanova, Penn.	36	Stevens, J. E. & Co., manufacturers, Cromwell, Conn.	1
Eusley, E., Golden, Colo.	56	Miller, Hall & Hartwell, Troy	22	Saul, Lester J. & Co., Albany	1
Eugel, Dr. Edward, Berlin, Germany	53	McGlynn, M., San Francisco	15	Simon, Greenebaum & Rosen, manufacturers, New York	1
Fowler, H., Lincoln, Cal.	59	Mace, Prof. Wm. H., University of Syracuse, New York	60	Seligman, Prof. Edwin R., Columbia College, New York	1
Forbes, Prof. Geo. M., Rochester University, N. Y.	58	National Labor Society, London	36	Siegel & Bros., E., Chicago, Ill.	1
Fisk, Col. A. C., Denver, Colo.	46	Newburyport Shoe Co., Conn.	40	Strouss, Eisendrath & Dromi, manufacturers, Chicago, Ill.	1
Foster, John, Beloit, Wis.	30	North, Rev. F. Mason, New York	25	Stuart & Corse, New York	1
Foy, Harrow & Chadwick, N. Y.	44	Nipoma (Cal.) Committee	60	Schwab, Prof. John C., Yale University	1
Foster, Frank K., editor "Labor Leader," Boston, Mass.	47	Noyes, M. T., Stockton, Cal.	57	Standard Fashion Co., New York	1
Furuset, Andrew, San Francisco	32	Neill, D. J., Prescott, Ark.	59	Thompson & Beard, Napa, Cal.	1
Freeman, R. L., Ashville, Ala.	46	Olinger, J. B., Sanger, Cal.	57	Thomas, Hon. J. L., U. S. Office Department	1
Galveston Cotton Mills, Texas	25	Openheimer, S., New York	32	Varden, F. M., Auburn, Cal.	1
Gaunt & Janvier, New York	44	O'Sullivan, Hon. P., Ludlow, Ky.	31	Von Duering, D., Napa, Cal.	1
Gilbert, G. G., Corning, Cal.	60	Patten, Prof. S. N., Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania	49	Vander Poest, Wm., New York	1
Gillman, W. F., St. Helena, Cal.	59	Perkins, G. W., Chicago, Ill.	34	Warner Bros., New York	1
Gilbert Mfg. Co., New York	38	Patterson, Joseph H., New York	49	Wanamaker, Hon. John, Phila.	1
Griffith, S. G., Rice Lake, Wis.	31	Paasche, Dr., Berlin, Germany	29	Warren, Prof., Ohio Univ.	1
Goodrich, B. F. & Co., Akron, O.	31	Page, Chas. N., Des Moines, Iowa	30	Welcher, H. E. & Co., manufacturers, Rochester, N. Y.	1
Gladstone Mfg. Co., New York	26	Peddle, T. B. & Co., New York	44	Waukenhose Mfg. Co., Boston	1
Hadley, Prof. A. T., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.	45	Petrie, Prof., Phil. Soc., London	22	Webber, Col. J. H., New York	1
Helms, W. H., Kingville, Ont.	60	Parker, W. J., Daggett, Cal.	52	Wand, Thomas, Yost, Utah	1
		Providence Shade Roller Co., Providence, R. I.	32	Worthington, S. & Co., New York	1

NUMBER 2

—OF—

“A NOVEL PROPOSITION,”

SHOWING HOW THE RATE OF WAGES

(IN MANUFACTURING CENTERS)

—AND THE—

DEMAND FOR SKILLED LABOR

IS INFLUENCED BY

THE COST OF TRANSPORTATION ON FARM PRODUCTS.

ADVOCATING A PLAN FOR THE MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

AS FOLLOWS:

CLASSIFICATION ONE, OR SMALL PACKAGE TRANSPORTATION:—SPECIFIED FARM PRODUCTS IN LIMITED WEIGHT AND BULK TO BE MAILABLE AND FORWARDED THROUGH THE UNITED STATES POSTOFFICE DEPARTMENT AT A UNIFORM RATE OF ONE CENT PER POUND FOR ANY DISTANCE WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

CLASSIFICATION TWO:—TRANSPORTATION IN ANY QUANTITY AT A REDUCED RATE TO MARKET CENTERS. INCREASING THE RATE OF REDUCTION IN PROPORTION TO THE RATIO OF DISTANCE FURTHER FROM THE MARKET CENTERS, OR, FOR AN EVEN RATE FOR ANY DISTANCE (WITHIN REASONABLE BOUNDS) TO MARKET CENTERS.

CLASSIFICATION THREE:—TRANSPORTATION IN ANY QUANTITY AT REDUCED RATE FROM SEAPORTS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES TO FOREIGN SEAPORTS.

All relating to Farm Products in their Natural State raised within the United States.

OF INTEREST ALIKE TO AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURE,
COMMERCE AND LABOR.

BY DAVID LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.

SACRAMENTO:

D. JOHNSTON & Co., PRINTERS.

1894.



INTRODUCTORY.

The writer in publishing this pamphlet has not done so in order to get rid of spare time, for he has none: nor as a matter of amusement, for it is too costly. The pamphlet has been placed before the people of the United States as a means of bettering their condition.

Encouraging letters have been received from farmers from every section of the Union, urging the writer to continue on in the work. There are enough of these on hand to make up a large volume, were they published. These are good enough in their way, but this alone would not go very far toward a practical realization. The time has now come when farmers and workingmen may determine in a practical manner how their best interests may be served. Let them unite on this proposition, and there is no other political power that can defeat them. The misfortune of past attempts by farmers has mainly been in the great number of reforms they attempted to carry out at one time, and as a result they generally failed in all.

Let them take a wholesome lesson from the dominant political parties, who always manage to get into power by each having a single "cry"—the republicans "protection," and the democrats "tariff reform." The farmers may struggle on for centuries without success until they learn by experience that one "cry" may succeed, and that more than one means failure.

There is but one way to carry this tion, and that way is to permit no other propositions onto it. When publishers wanted their novels carried by the U. S. Postoffice Department at one pound in any quantity, they did not tack a clause for government owned railways. Had they done so, they would not have had their bill pass. Now just as it would have been for the publishers to tack on other propositions to it will equally be so with this proposition were it attempted.

In short, if the farmers and workingmen wish this proposition carried, they must stick to it provided they unite and stick to one. No, I ought to modify the above to "wish this proposition carried enough. Energy, courage and tenacity must be had, and plenty of it, and of the right kind. These qualities are not evolved by a pamphlet, but by men, by some means or other.

It is to be hoped that this pamphlet will reach any given section, find its way into the hands of these few, and that they will educate, agitate and organize, and thus will carry on the good fight until it is a success here.

Reader, why cannot you be "one of the few?"

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Correspondents will please write plainly and as briefly as possible. I promise to promptly answer any time will permit. In order to achieve practical results it will be necessary to form a Central National Organization. With that object in view, each locality should present this proposition in public assemblies, and appoint promulgating committees. A list of these committees should be sent me, and when a sufficient number have been formed a call made for a National Convention. In the meantime, efforts should be made to form local organizations.

Fifty thousand of these pamphlets have been printed, and copies of these will be sent to any part of the United States. As the plates are electrotyped, more will be printed as required.

Newspapers friendly to the cause will please mention that this Pamphlet made Free of Charge by addressing
D. LUBIN, Sacramento, California

A PROPOSITION

Advocating a Plan for the More Equitable Distribution of Wealth. Farm Products Moved at Reduced Cost for Transportation to Market Centers.

By DAVID LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA.

CHAPTER I.

The Proposition May Be Divided Into Three Classifications, as Follows:

FIRST—Small package transportation.

SECOND—Transportation in any quantity, at a reduced rate to market centers, increasing the rate of reduction in proportion to the ratio of distance further from the market centers. Or, for an even rate for any distance (within reasonable bounds) to market centers.

THIRD—Transportation in any quantity from ports within the United States to foreign ports.

All relating to farm products in their natural state raised within the United States.

FURTHER DETAIL.

Classification one, or small package transportation:

Specified farm products in limited weight and bulk to be mailable and forwarded through the United States Postoffice Department at a uniform rate of one cent per pound for any distance within the Union.

Classification two; transportation of farm products in any quantity within the United States.

This division offers the greatest obstacles to be overcome, and that chiefly because the field is new and untried.

Suggestions are offered in the three following examples:

EXAMPLE A—THE AVERAGE PLAN.

Gain to 4 and 3. Loss to 2 and 1.

CALIFORNIA.	STATION FOUR.		STATION THREE.		STATION TWO.		STATION ONE.		NEW YORK.
	Present Cost	\$2 00		\$1 50		\$1 00		\$ 50c	
	Average	1 25		1 25		1 25		1 25	
	Gain	75c	Gain	25c	Loss	25c	Loss	75c	

EXAMPLE B—REDUCTION FROM NORTH, WEST AND SOUTH TO EAST ONLY.

Loss to U. S. 12 Per Cent. on East Bound Only.

CALIFORNIA.	STATION FOUR.		STATION THREE.		STATION TWO.		STATION ONE.		NEW YORK.
	Present Cost	\$2 00		\$1 50		\$1 00		50c	
	Reduct'n by U. S. 20 per ct. eastw'd.	1 60	Reduct'n by U. S. 10 per ct. eastw'd.	1 35	Reduct'n by U. S. 5 per ct. eastw'd.	95c			
	Loss by U.S.Gov.	40c		15c		5c			

Total U.S. Loss, 12 per cent.

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

EXAMPLE C—AN EVEN RATE FOR ANY DISTANCE.

CALIFORNIA.		STATION FOUR.		STATION THREE.		STATION TWO.		STATION ONE.	
	Present Cost.	\$2 00	-----	\$1 50	-----	\$1 00	-----	50c	Pre
	U. S. Av- erage.	50	-----	50	-----	50	-----	50c	U. S.
	U. S. Loss	1 50	-----	U. S. Loss 1 00	-----	50	-----	0	U. S.

Or an average of 60 per cent.

Example A is the average plan, and is considered of the least practical value.

Examples B and C will now be taken up for discussion.

Preconceived notions are hard to overcome, not alone by the simple—but even by the highly educated. Especially difficult is it to overcome them when the preconceived notions are in harmony with the established method in general operation. A practical test would of course do much to modify opposition, but the greatest difficulty would arise in obtaining the consent to this test. While it is feared that the most convincing argument would at the start create but little impression—yet I deem it a duty to offer such arguments as I am able at this time, hoping that abler minds may supplement what is here set forth in a much more convincing manner.

I lay it down as an axiom that the interests of our country can best be served by **protection against foreign nations, and by absolute and unhampered free trade among the several states of the Union.** Now as long as our territorial extent is almost as great as the continent of Europe, it is manifestly impossible to maintain free trade between the several states and sections as long as the factor of distance creates an uneven charge for transportation.

Broadly speaking, this is true of every kind of transportation, but the unevenness is felt in a much greater degree in agricultural products, when transported in their natural states, than in the average for manufactured goods. A suit of clothes weighing 10 pounds and costing \$15, may be transported from New York to San Francisco at about 1 per cent. Ten pounds of peaches from San Francisco to New York will cost about 250 per cent. The reason is clear. The 10 pounds of suit is so much more expensive than the 10 pounds of peaches.

This fact is of course well known, and being *no general is deemed a fixed law* in the social

arrangement. The question remains just law? Is it a law that has been the bettering of the condition of the race? We may unhesitatingly say not so much a law as a custom. For no law unless it be grounded in justice, but custom is not grounded in justice, but tice, and injustice is never a factor in the

Just as soon as we examine into it with unbiassed mind, we find that in its general operation, has done all unjust device can do in multiplying taining poverty, wretchedness, and ness. Wherever we turn our mind countries of the semi-civilized races, the most civilized, even though the conditions be the most suitable for habitation—as soon as the location is moved as to make transportation almost prohibitory, there we will find jority always on the verge of destit beggary. And it is for this very reason phenomenon takes place that vast tr tile lands, with all its natural wealth fers a crust or habitable shelter to its inhabitants. Furnishing in sheer re penalty for maintaining such outrage just custom, the countless hords of ir who flock to the more congested ce fight with their more fortunate fello the crust of bread denied them at ho is not a single example on the globe be shown in its operation contrar; is here set forth. The overwhel proportion in the ratio of weight checks production and consumption extent as to diminish general co earning capacity, or, in other wor main cause for poverty—not alor United States, but everywhere else.

While it is true that our country a ent time offers an apparent contra

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

neral rule—that the west and northwest, at a remote distance from the market, offers no horde of beggars—it is also that the time is rapidly approaching when the universally unjust custom in operation, as well as in other sections of the country, will bring us the same results.

perceptible ratio of increase in a given product, when the transportation rate is stationary, must result in lowering prices, and continue to do so until the increase is perceptible.

and just as long as there is land capable of production, there will be production, and unless transportation gives away, wages must, and all else does.

Example A is of course not deemed practical. We must, therefore, turn to examples B and C. And as the chief objectors will come from those at stations 2 and 1, it therefore becomes necessary that we address ourselves to them, and to make the matter as clear as possible in the dialogue form may be profitably employed.

CHAPTER II.

Do you consent to example B or C? A. I do not.

Do you object to argue the matter seriously, yes; but as a matter of amusement, no.

If you were to gain by its acceptance, would you refuse? A. No.

What are your objections? A. They are numerous to mention, and permit me to say that it is not my business to tell you my objections. It is your affair to show me how I can gain by it.

What are your main reasons for objecting? A. I have already told you that it is not my business to state them. You are to convince me; not I you. However, I don't object to that, in my judgment, it would reduce the price of my land perhaps seventy-five per cent, and put the prices of my product down fifty per cent or less; that is enough reason to start I hope.

Yes, your reasons are formidable, and will be overcome if I am to convince you; what is it that gives your property its value? A. Its proximity to the city.

Does proximity to a city give property its value? A. Yes.

Does proximity to a city, or to THE city, give it its value? A. THE city; for Palmyra is a city, and Chicago is a city,

but a farm of the same size and fertility near Chicago would be far more valuable than one near Palmyra.

Q. What tends to give it its value? A. The commercial advantages and wealth and number of inhabitants give it its value.

Q. What if these are decreased? A. It would decrease the value of the adjacent farming lands.

Q. What if these are increased? A. It would increase its value.

Q. If farming is rendered more profitable in the west and northwest or south, would it not tend to increase the population there? A. Yes.

Q. What is the main industry of the city to which your land is adjacent? A. Shirt and hat manufacturing.

Q. You have admitted that profitable farming out west would increase the population there; would not the increased number of inhabitants require more shirts and hats? A. Yes.

Q. If they bought more hats and shirts from the city adjacent to your farm, would not that require more shirt and hat makers? A. Yes.

Q. Would not that increase the inhabitants there? A. Yes.

Q. Would not the increase of inhabitants there increase the value of your property? A. Yes.

Q. It seems, therefore, that you were wrong in saying that your property would decrease in value seventy-five per cent? A. While I have been compelled to answer that it would not, I am still, however, of the opinion that it would, for the increased product that would pour in from the new developed sections would reduce the selling price of my product, which would tend to reduce my income perhaps by half, and this would reduce the value of my land.

Q. What do you raise? A. I raise fruits and vegetables.

Q. Do you market your fruits at the same time that the western fruits are marketed? A. No; not the same kind as a rule.

Q. And vegetables? A. The same.

Q. Those that are not marketed at the same time offer you no great opposition, do they? A. No.

Q. Now, were this reduced rate for transportation generally adopted in every section, would every section raise the fruits and vegetables raised by you only? or would some sections increase their average in tobacco, sugar-beet, corn, live stock, fowls, dairy products, honey, cotton, rice, hemp, hops, semi-tropical

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

fruits, etc.? A. They would increase the product in those also.

Q. Would these be competitors to you? A. No.

Q. Would not those employ many more hands also? A. Yes.

Q. Would they not also buy more shirts and hats of your city? A. Yes.

Q. Would this not increase the number of the inhabitants of your city? A. Yes.

Q. The great increase in farm products in the various sections, would this not tend to greatly increase manufacture in many other branches besides shirt and hat making? A. Yes.

Q. Would not these also buy hats and shirts? A. Yes.

Q. Would this not give you an increase demand for your product? A. I confess it would.

Q. Would not the greatly increased demand permit profitable disposition? Would not your land increase in value accordingly? A. It would seem so.

Example B illustrates where the United States government agrees to sustain a loss, greater in proportion as the ratio of distance is the further from the market centre, and for one direction only, and that leading towards the market centre, and not from it.

This example tends to reduce the inequality, but does not equalize the rates. This plan is in the nature of an attempt at equalization, and the most that could be expected from it is, that it would be likely to ultimately lead to the only just equalization possible, namely: an even rate for any distance.

Example C offers the most perfect mode for farm product distribution possible, and is more calculated to give our country that stable prosperity, so essential in the maintenance of our independence, and the highest development.

The most serious objection to example C is the expense. If found too costly for practicable operation, an average could be arrived at between examples B and C.

There is now left for consideration the third division of the classification.

THIRD, Transportation of farm products in any quantity from a seaport within the United States to foreign seaports:

This class of products embrace the great staples for export.

Examples B and C may be offered here, and hold the same relation to this class of transportation that it does to the second division.

Example B being the cheapest, but example C being the more equitable.

Apart from the cost to the government paying the current cost for transportation the reduction by the government to the producer or shipper, no great expense need be involved for officials and employees in carrying out the detail. The functions of the Post Office Custom House or Agricultural Department need only be enlarged and authorized to enter into contracts with the transportation companies, as is now done in making contracts. And, by the issuance of suitable bills or shipping receipts—by an Act of Congress—for use of shippers, no more is done. The shipper and consignee to authorized shipping receipt forwarding receiving their freight precisely as they receive it. The way-bills, properly vouched for, as presented by the transportation company to the central government office at Washington for the additional amounts.

CHAPTER III.

Recapitulations showing briefly what division of the three classifications should be adopted:

FIRST, SMALL PACKAGES OF SPECIFIC PRODUCTS, IN LIMITED WEIGHT AND SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO GO BY THE UNIFORM RATE, FOR ANY DISTANCE ONE CENT PER POUND.

First, because trashy novels go through now, and in any quantity and at the same rate. There is no valid reason other than the wickedness or profound stupidity to deny this right to fruits and flowers, cheese or vegetables, and cheerfully give such vile trash as "The World, the Flesh, and the Devil," "A Crown of Shame," "Old Mam'selle's Secret," "Wife in Only," "Professional Thieves," "Circumstances," "Fair Women," "The Burglar's Fate," "Rogue's Life," "Mollie Maguires," "Rogues and Strikers and Communists," "A Little Circé," "Bank Robbers," etc., etc., etc.

The forwarding of fruits, flowers and specified farm products are permitted to matter in England, Germany and other countries. Why should this class of be denied the right that is so lavish to trashy novel publishers, dry goods and general merchandise houses and newspaper

The importance of this classification hardly be overestimated. The adoption of "classification one," in itself, will be a wonderful change in the betterment of conditions of the farmer.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

acre farm will then be more profitable
ty or even a hundred-acre farm now.
employ profitably every member of
ly capable of doing any work what-
e product will then find its way direct
hands of the consumer, and for cash
e.

an, with the assistance of several chil-
l then be able to earn as much on two
berries, in the sale not alone of fresh
in the form of jellies, preserves, etc.,
could earn on fifty acres of wheat.
may be said of dairy products, fowls,
other farm products. Her customers
e as far apart as San Francisco and
e, or only a mile from the farm, and
ound would carry the product to the

ultiplication of small farms would
e at a rapid rate, and would largely
draw many families now in cities to
ry. The benefits would also be largely
the consumer.

ification one" should by all means be
and it can be carried by proper effort.
the farmers ever ask any administra-
his privilege, that administration will
e it. Let them just ask for it, and
get it.

all things, however, let them ask for
"form."

te a petition, not as a grange, nor as
e, nor as populists, but as American
nd voters, and note the result.

m ask the merchants and working-
up them in their effort, and the effort
ed.

once this has been accomplished, the
ruit-grower, the floriculturist, the
etc., can begin to do a "mail order"
just like the novel publisher and
al merchandise man does. His sales
ade direct to families (as is done in
Germany and in other European
nts), and for cash in advance, and
rt of the country.

ill start the petition? Who will set
on until it will require a car to carry
Washington? Who?

CHAPTER IV.

SECOND CLASSIFICATION.

ation of farm products in their
al state in any quantity within the
1 States.

ond division of the classification has
en spoken of at length.

We may, however, add here that the protect-
ive tariff is intended as a means for the main-
tenance of a maximum wage rate. The article
in this pamphlet entitled "Distance as a factor
in wages," page —, attempts to prove that the
tariff and the prevention of immigration will
not prevent a steady decline in the wage rate.

That the elimination of the factor of cost for
distance on farm products is the only efficient
method for the creating and maintaining of a
steady demand for labor, and for the main-
taining of a maximum wage rate. Hence, as
an economic measure in the maintenance of
wages, and as an efficient supplement to the
protective tariff—on these grounds alone, if on
no other—the second division of the classifica-
tion should prevail. For, unless this is done,
the tariff becomes a one-sided tax, and not a
protection to labor.

THE THIRD CLASSIFICATION.

**Transportation of farm products in their
natural state in any quantity from sea-
ports within the United States to foreign
seaports.**

The third division of the classification does
not so much require arguments to sustain it as
it does a plain statement of facts. Every in-
dustry and occupation (except the production
of the great staple agricultural products) in
the United States is protected by the tariff, but
the chief industry in the United States (the
exception above referred to) receives no pro-
tection whatever.

On the contrary, it pays for the protection of
all other industries, every penny of it, which
is an injustice. It is more than an injustice;
it is slowly but surely preparing the way for
the overturning of law and order.

Ask the southern planter what kind of a
showing his last year's balance sheet made on
his cotton crop?

Ask the wheat growers of the United States
what were their net returns for wheat raising?

Was the shrinkage in prices caused by the
decline in silver, by the financial stringency?

No. It was caused by the use of approved
modern appliances for agricultural labor, in
the hands of countless hordes of docile, cheap
labor workers in many important sections of
the world.

These approved modern appliances once used
are never abandoned. This is what has brought
wheat, cotton and the other staples down to
the prices at which they can be had.

To be sure, there is a chance for an advanced

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

price, but this price is contingent on some great calamities in those foreign cheap-labor countries. We should, however, not wish for them in the hope of a temporary gain.

Nor indeed will even our wishes do any good, for we are dealing with facts, not fancies. There are the alternatives of reducing wages, reducing the acreage, or abandoning the production of staple products. The reduction of the acreage will curtail our exports, and, as soon as we begin to pay for our imports in gold in place of in products, it will rapidly diminish our wealth, and force wages down. And as long as the cost of production continues to be lessened in the cheap labor countries of the world, in the employment by them of approved modern agricultural labor-saving devices, just so long will prices decline, and wages follow in the decline accordingly.

The third division of the classification offers, however, a simple, yet efficient means of protection for the staple farm products in the reduction by the United States Government of the cost for transportation, which, when done, will not only obtain for the grower the advanced price on the quantity exported, but the same advanced price will hold good for the much greater quantity consumed at home.

This is clearly illustrated in the article "How Rates Affect the Wheat Grower," on page 14 of this pamphlet.

In conclusion, there is ample reason to believe that the three divisions of the classification have been clearly set forth, together with the reasons why they should be seriously considered by the American citizens, irrespective of political affiliations or party lines.

DISTANCE AS A FACTOR IN WAGES.

CHAPTER VI.

How the Wage Rate Is Influenced by the Margin of Profit on Farm Products.

IMPORTANCE AND MAGNITUDE OF OUR COUNTRY.

The most remarkable fact in the history of mankind is the rapid rise, and the political and territorial greatness of the United States. The future progress of this country will depend on the tendency and in the ability of the directing power to think, see, and to direct aright. Unless this power possesses that ability, the entire structure—like a child's house of cards—may fall. But, if guided properly, the present unparalleled rise and greatness will be eclipsed, and in the near future this country may rank without a peer among the nations of the earth, and the whole world may be guided and directed by her will.

That the essentials for this future greatness are here may be inferred from the fact that the present inhabitants of this country are among the most advanced and progressive in the world; that the climate and natural resources are suited to develop the genius of an energetic race, and in territorial extent she stands without a rival to-day among the civilized nations.

The entire area of Europe is 3,823,388 square miles. That of the United States including Alaska, is 3,557,009 square miles. It will therefore be observed that the territorial extent of the United States is very nearly as great as that of the entire continent of Europe.

Europe contains a population of 323,769,000, and the United States between 60,000,000 and 70,000,000. And yet there are those who make a clamor that we "let down the bars" and "close the gate" to further immigration.

IMMIGRATION.

Have we, then, reached the maximum, when a further increase can no longer add to the prosperity of those already here? Can we not, like Europe, support 323,000,000? Is not our

advantage in soil and climate equal to that of Europe? Most assuredly it is.

Are we then satisfied with our present numerical ratio of population, so as to warrant the cry of "close the gates?"

Would not this policy, if adopted, be a Malthusianism run to madness?

Here is a territory capable of sustaining at least 323 millions, and yet some few among us say that the 263 or 273 millions more shall not materialize—that there is room for no more. Why shall immigration cease? Immigration must cease because the coming of more workers tends to lower wages. Suppose it can be shown that their coming is not the cause for the reduction in wages; that some cause other than this is what brings about a reduction, what then? No other cause can be shown; for when five men clamor for work that can be done by three, two must remain idle, or the wage rate must come down. Such is about the condition already, and by permitting more to come it must continue to lower the rate. No; no other cause can be found when the matter is viewed from that point only. Suppose, however, that there is a factor involved in the lowering of wages that has not been considered, and suppose, further, that in this factor is to be found the real cause for a gradual decline in wages, what then? What is that cause? It is distance.

CHAPTER VII.

DISTANCE AS A FACTOR.

On a globe of the world, place one point of a compass at San Francisco and the other at New York, then fasten the compass at that angle. Now apply one point of this fixed angle to London and the other in an easterly direction, and we find that the other point of the compass will just touch the Aral sea in Turkestan, which is situated just north of the boundary between Persia and Afghanistan.

Again; apply one point to Berlin, and the other point will just touch the boundary line

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

Chinese Empire, showing that from San Francisco to New York is as far as from London to Turkestan, or from Berlin to the center of the Chinese Empire.

Let us suppose the following: That fruit-growers of England and Germany, at three and one-half cents per pound for their fruits, were compelled to forward their

Turkestan, and those in Germany to the East as their market, and that their former markets, London and Berlin, would no longer demand for their products to one-third the former quantity. Let us further

suppose that there would be ample railroad facilities to those distant destinations at a rate of one per cent. gross on fruits; that the product of each its destination in saleable condition; that the people of Turkestan and Persia would agree to pay, when delivered to their respective countries, to the English and American fruit-growers the same price that they received in Berlin. What would hap-

pen? Following: First—The ruling prices in London and Berlin would be no higher than those ruled by the Turkestan and Mongolian markets, and as these merchants would first meet the cost for transportation, which would be one per cent. gross, the buyer would offer no more than one cent a pound. No higher price for export being received, the surplus would be sold at that price, and the quarter to the home market would not bring any more price, for the English and German merchant would refuse to pay any more than did the Turkestan and Mongolian merchants. England and Germany compelled to lose those distant countries as illustrated, civilization would rapidly decline to the level of the lowest wage rate of semi-barbarism.

If fruit-raising were a prime industry serving existing conditions attentively, it is noted that the greatest consumption of products and manufacture does not so much take place where the population is most dense as where the standard of the majority is highest. For this class of population is most likely to have valuable farm products and manufactures most readily be disposed of, especially requiring prompt disposition, and the producer is put to a nominal expense for transportation and commission.

In English and French fruitgrower may be seen of his crops with scarce any risk, and at a slight cost for commission or transporta-

tion. The fruit-grower of Spain, Italy, Turkey, Africa or Syria, cannot do this near as easily, wages in the last-named countries being lower, if not the lowest in Europe.

Now shall we now say of the vast distances traversed in many important sections of the United States before reaching the market country?

Spain is compelled to land her fruits in London at an average of three and one-half cents per pound. Out of this three and one-half cents the transportation company (for its time) receives two and one-half cents, leaving the grower an average of one cent, thus the producer pays two hundred

and fifty per cent. on the gross amount for transportation. This is perhaps the highest gross per cent. paid for transportation in the United States, and yet the railroad company may not make any more profit on the carriage of fruits than it does on dry goods. The difference being in the low per cent. rate of dry goods, and the high per cent. rate on fruits.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ALTERNATIVES.

Under this condition there are but four alternatives:

(1) Coolies must be employed, or (2) wages of white men must decline; (3) transportation rates must be lowered, or (4) the occupation be abandoned.

The United States government has already intimated by recent acts that coolies are not wanted. The transportation companies have earnestly declared that it is absolutely impossible for them to lower the fruit rates, and exist. There is therefore room for no other course of procedure under existing conditions, except it be in the lowering of wages or in the abandonment of the occupation. This latter alternative, however, will hardly be submitted to without a serious struggle; and, unless, as said before, the conditions are altered, the struggle will be for cheap labor—white labor if it can be had, and if not, then coolie labor.

It is just as impossible to maintain an increasing field product industry on a high wage basis and pay 250 per cent. for transportation in this country, as it is impossible to do so in Afghanistan.

Place London or New York in the midst of Afghanistan and give her the same political advantages, and wages there will steadily advance to New England or British rates. The invariable rule is, the further from the market the lower the net returns to the producer; and the lower the net return, the lower the wage rate.

That the wage rate has not yet declined to a marked degree is because all the acreage planted and to be planted is not yet in bearing. It must be borne in mind, that an increase of trees and vines where the yield is ample, and the net return lessened in a ratio to the increase of the product, is a greater competitor in the reduction of wages than is an immigrant, for every additional tree and vine becomes a competitor and tends to lower the price of the product. And, unless there is a corresponding decrease in transportation, the rate of wages must decline, or the surplus trees and vines be grubbed out. Grubbing out trees and vines will only be resorted to when every expedient in the procurement of cheap labor shall have failed. And in this battle for existence cheap labor must win, as it has won in every other division of the world.

The grower will pay no higher wage than the highest he can afford, and when that highest is a low wage, that low wage will become the standard, and when once the standard, will tend to lower the rate in other occupations and sections, for two reasons: First, because a large body of field workers, having become accustomed to receiving low wages in any country, will gladly accept the same rate

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

Secondly, because the lessened pay of the field hands will enable them to purchase the coarser grades of goods only, hence lessening the demand for skilled workmen.

CHAPTER IX.

THE COST FOR DISTANCE IN THE CARRIAGE OF FARM PRODUCTS AS A FACTOR IN WAGES.

Summing up, we may say that the continued increase of acreage of a field product at a remote distance from the market, without a corresponding decrease of production of a like product in other sections, demands either a constant decrease of wages, or a gradual decrease in the cost for transportation; that wages may be maintained in remote sections if the transportation be correspondingly lowered, but if this is not the case, wages must decline. When the remote area to be cultivated is vast, and the transportation rate declines in a ratio to the increase, then it is not alone wisdom to permit immigration, but it is rather folly and loss to prevent it, for in that case the high-wage field worker becomes a consumer of skilled labor goods. Shutting out immigrants will not have the effect in maintaining a high wage as long as field products tend to increase as rapidly as they do in the vast and important sections of the Union situated at remote distances from the market, and with the maintenance of maximum rates for transportation. We must therefore conclude that in our country it is not immigration that tends to a permanent lowering of wages, but it is the high cost for transportation on field products raised in an increasing ratio of quantity at remote distances from the market. That the further the distance and the greater the increase of the volume of production the lower the wage rate will decline.

This is a fixed law, as invariable as the law of gravitation.

The fruit industry here may continue for quite a number of years and pay fair but declining field wages, but year after year will surely bring the steady reductions until the \$26 and board rate will dwindle down to \$15 and board, then to \$10, then to the Southern figure of \$6, and there it may stop. When that time is here we will have a "poor white trash," and there will be no more demand for labor unions here than there is in Asia Minor. Distance, and not immigration, will have done its leveling, as it has done in every part of the world.

The deteriorating effect of a low wage rate in any extensive territorial section is manifest, not alone in the lessened comfort to the laborer by reason of his meager compensation, but in his lessened purchasing power. Skilled labor receives scarce any support from such a source. Proof of this may be had in comparing the class and grade of merchandise in demand in the southern states (where field labor is paid a minimum wage rate) with those sections of the Union where field labor receives a maximum rate. The deteriorating effect is further manifest in this: that the only agricultural sections of the Union having a "poor white trash" is where field labor receives a minimum wage rate.

In other words, if \$26.00 a month and board for field labor yields as a product a condition favorable to nineteenth century civilization—

a \$6 a month wage for field labor tends retrogression to the eighteenth or seventeenth century civilization.

There are but two methods for overcoming the difficulty: one is in government ownership of railroads, and for the government to take them at cost, or even at a loss; the other is for the government to pay a proportionately necessary decrease of transporting fares from remote sections to the markets.

This latter plan is the one advocated as most practicable and feasible. Offered obstacles in its accomplishment, it is likely to afford the immediate relief so actively demanded.

A well-informed Trades-Union man in conversation with the writer on the subject of government ownership of railroads, said: "In my opinion it would be a dangerous experiment. The railroads employ near seven hundred thousand men. Each of these has at least one vote, and when voting time would come the muster at least 1,400,000 votes solid for government ownership." He further said: "Constitutionally it is fine in theory, but in practice victors belong the spoils" is found to be practical."

Another objection equally serious is the enormous amount of money required to take over the railroads, even were it seriously contemplated. This government will not confiscate. It will only buy at the will and price of the owner. What if the owner ask a very high price? The government builds parallel roads, in the nature of a direct injury, and confiscation of property. It can, of course, refuse any further franchise, and withhold demand for those expiring. Where does the vast amount of money come from required to build or purchase?

If from interest-bearing bonds, will the high purchasing price foot the interest volume so vast as to increase rather than diminish the burden?

If in greenbacks, will this not appreciate silver above its normal value, and tend to decrease the purchasing power of the vast volume of greenbacks necessary for the purpose?

CHAPTER X.

THE PROPOSITION.

Altogether the difficulties in the way of government ownership of railroads are too numerous to be if not insurmountable.

The proposition to have the government own a proportion for the necessary decrease of transporting farm products from remote sections to the market centres offers scarce difficulties. For when the advantages of the proposition are once understood, there but few to oppose it. It involves no machinery in its carrying out than the creation of a Government Auditing Department and the issuance of government shipping receipts. The government is not to handle, receive, or ship the freight. All this work is to be done as it is done now, the shipper delivering and receiving products just as he does now, and the only new feature will be the use of government shipping receipts. And the purpose of the shipping receipt is to serve

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

ion by the transportation company
tional amount due from the govern-
sending it on for collection to the
Department at Washington.

be argued that there is danger that
this system is once adopted that the
companies might combine and run
so high as to offset the reduction.
there is a will there is a way, and,
r, railroad combinations, by reason
l advantages they possess, do not
Besides, bids for a large share of
ny one road would tend to break
ons quicker than evenly distributed
in that event the government ship-
ots would only be valid on the road
ce is reasonable, thus bringing the
s to terms.

d also be considered that by the
of this system every voter becomes
) a shipper, and we may expect for
n that unjust advantages will become
on the part of the transportation
than those complained of when
idual shipper was compelled to fight
is own hook.

A SEEMING CONTRADICTION.

he present high rate for field labor
f the remote sections of the Union
contrary to the general law pointed
adly explained by the words "pres-
ates."

he high rates can only be maintained
is of a maximum cost for transporta-
ng as the total production is just
a limited consumption. But every
acre put to the same product in the
ction, without a corresponding de-
cost for transportation, must lower
he grower will lose profit, interest
ple.

CHAPTER XI.

: ON THE GROWER NEAR THE MARKET CENTRE.

this proposition be adopted what
ne of the grower near the market
/ill he not lose in the ratio as the
e remote section gains?

will not loose! but on the contrary he
is much if not more than the man
ote section, and for these reasons:
l the products of the same kind in
s sections do not mature, and are not
at the same time. Secondly, as soon
stry capable of indefinite expansion
rofitable there is a rapid expansion of
stry, thereby employment is largely
n this and in every other branch of
resulting in increasing materially the
1, not alone of the remote section,
market centers themselves, thereby
the value of that market to those
g lands adjacent to it.

IS IT PATERNALISM?

not the adoption of this proposition
dism? It would be no less and no
rnal than the protective tariff is now,
ld actually do what protection aims
ould tend to maintain a high stand-
ges, and would, in addition, do some-
the protective tariff is not able to do,

and that is it will create a steady demand for
labor in every department of industry, and as
long as this plan is in operation it will con-
tinue to maintain that steady demand. And
in place of discouraging immigration the new
proposition will find immigration profitable.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE TRADE UNION.

Cannot trade unionism maintain a high rate
of wages (as they have done in the past) if this
plan be not adopted?

No; for whenever the demand for labor is
brisk the Union is in a flourishing condition,
but whenever the demand slackens the mem-
bership declines. Besides, it is as impossible for
the Union to overthrow natural laws as it is
for any other organization of men to do so.

They cannot become a potent factor in the
maintaining of a high rate of wages as long as
the remote farming sections slowly but continu-
ously reduce them. For our country, immigra-
tion is no factor in wages at all. It seems to
be, but this "seems" is a delusion.

Distance is THE factor, THE chief factor, THE
only factor.

Because it is THE factor, must it ever remain
so? The confirmed conservative is prompted
to answer: "Yes; we cannot tamper with
natural laws, for if we once begin we cannot
tell where innovation will cease." To which
the advocate of progress may reply: "Shall we
then permit the natural law to work out its
leveling process here as it has done in othe.
sections of the world? If we do, have we not
arrived at the beginning of the end of our pros-
perity? Is not every useful invention an inno-
vation? Were not Arkwright, Howe, Fulton,
Field, Ericson and the thousand other inven-
tors in their day condemned as innovators?
Was not the Declaration of Independence
considered as an innovation? Was not every
progressive step in religion, in legislation, in
social science, called an innovation? Must we
placidly glide on the dangerous stream leading
toward the stagnant ocean of retrogression, be-
cause any attempt in a progressive line will be
cried down as innovation?

The cry of Halt! would come with better
grace if our conservative friend manifested
more manliness and less timidity. Were he to
speak any truth in the interest of civilization,
in place of merely looking wise, and ever
croaking his stereotyped "Halt! 1 object."
Were he sincere, he could say: The land has
been robbed of its virtue. In the east first, then
in the south, in the middle states, in the
northwest, and now in the west.

The value of the heritage has been lessened,
and the land that we leave is not the land we
obtained. Its fertility is diminishing, and in
many sections it is gone. What have we done!
We have impoverished that which we should
not have impaired. The natural law demands
that we put back the virtue we drain from the
land. Obey the natural laws, by applying the
needed manures to our lands, and its increased
fertility will compensate for the distance the
products have to traverse before reaching the
market. The advocate for progress would be
likely to answer thus: "The impoverished
lands at a distance offer no return for expensive
manures, and the additional new and fertile
lands constantly being brought under cultiva-
tion only swell the sum total of the product

(Opinions and clippings, or comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

raised until the maximum quantity is produced, and when that is reached the trouble is upon us, and the factor of transportation increasing with the ratio of distance, on an ever-increasing quantity of production, leaves us powerless, helpless, defenseless, at the absolute mercy of our master, whose ever-threatening writ of foreclosure prompts escape through the avenue of cheap servile labor. Day by day this threatening danger approaches closer, and we must find relief or ultimately perish."

Such is the result of the law of distance, when left to work out its ultimate effect, not alone in operation here, but in every section of the world.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ULTIMATE EFFECT.

If we quietly permit the timid conservative to have his way in his "Halt! I object," and permit the law of distance to do its work in the leveling process, as it has done it everywhere else, we will soon have a different kind of civilization. We shall have a "poor white trash," a proletariat, and an oligarchy in every section of the Union. And when once here, they will be here to stay. We may even then call the head man President, and the assembled chief oligarchs a Senate, but this will only be an act of custom, and false to truth. And when the first oligarchic chief shall will it, he will declare that he is king and sovereign—sole and without peer.

Impossible? In the palmy days of the republic the sturdy Romans thought so too, but when the time came when the freeholder was driven from his land by foreclosures; when Roman statesmanship saw it, and did not raise voice, nor apply means to prevent it, then came the beginning of the end. And when at last the freeholder was gone, replaced by the renter and by servile labor, then came the end; and a miserable end it was. Was it undeserved? No. And thus may it befall us if we, too, are neglectful of our duty; unmindful of the precept of that greatest among America's statesmen when he proclaimed "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Our conservative friend need, however, feel no alarm at what he is pleased to call an innovation. Let him please remember that the present postal system and postal rates were considered an innovation when its advocate promulgated his idea.

More than that: Hungary has made an experiment in the elimination of distance in the adoption of the "zone system," and with great success.

The advocates desire the adoption of the proposition herein outlined in the carriage of

farm products from the remote sections throughout the entire United States, in all directions, if possible; and if not, then the remote distant points to the markets. Reducing the rate to an even ch any distance, if possible; if not, then the rate in the greater amount from the of greater distance. Not for dry goods unfactured ware, but for farm products natural state. The one per cent. on n tures can take care of itself, but two and fifty per cent. on farm products ca

Agriculture with the freeholder eli and the Republic is no more. Let holder agriculturist not be eliminated. eliminate the ratio rate in the charge tance.

CHAPTER XIII.

How Rates Affect the Wheat Grower ration of the Law of Trade to the vantage of the Producer—The P Transportation is Always Dedu the Foreign Buyer.

The table of figures below illustrate price of wheat is governed, and how for transportation regulates the amount net returns to the wheat grower. It clearly show what advantages the wheat will derive by the adoption of class three (as outlined on p. 3) in lowering ping rates in the carriage of farm products the United States Government from a in the United States to foreign ports.

All may understand it who will take pains to read it carefully, and when understood, is not easily forgotten.

Before reading the table it must be mind that the price for wheat is fixed in Liverpool, and the net price to the wheat grower is the Liverpool price, less the cost for transportation from the place of purchase to Liverpool. Thus, if the price in Liverpool is \$1 per bushel and the wheat for sale is in Sacramento the cost for transportation for wheat from Sacramento to Liverpool is 20 cents per bushel, the highest price that will be paid for the wheat in Sacramento will be 80 cents per bushel.

In the example given below I have taken 100 hundred bushels of wheat in the warehouse in Sacramento, ten bushels of which were a foreign buyer and ninety bushels to a buyer, for use at a local mill. The first two conditions as they are now. The third and fourth illustrate the change that would take place in the net return to the wheat-grower upon the adoption of the position advocated:

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

Loss to Government ..	50c	\$1 00	1 50
Surplus to grower on bushels	\$5 00	10 00	15 00
Total for the 100 bush- to grower	\$80 00	85 00	90 00
paid by home buyer 90 bushels	\$72 00	76 50	81 00
aid by foreign buyer 10 bushels	\$8 00	8 50	9 00
Government loss	50c	\$1 00	1 50
Government charge for 10 bushels exported	\$1 50	1 00	50c
Price per bushel to grower	80c	85c	90c
Freight to foreign buyer per bushel	20c	15c	10c
Light from Sacramento Liverpool per bushel ..	20c	20c	20c
in Liverpool, wheat, bushel	\$1 00	1 00	1 00

very same law operates in precisely the manner with fruits, cotton, rice, potatoes, or any product requiring transportation, for any distance, and with the same result whether exported to a foreign country or exported within the same country, and where the haul be fifteen thousand miles or less.

It is shown conclusively that the grower always deducts the price for freight offering a price for products which he has to buy for his market. As soon as this is accepted, the accepted price becomes the price as well, even though the home has no transportation to pay for.

wheat growers can now clearly see what benefit and injury is done them by ship owners combine for a high cost for transportation, as is the case this year, when the San Francisco speculators chartered the sailing vessel and raised the price for transportations. Wheat growers not only lost the extra freight paid to the speculator who chartered it, but they also lost a like amount on the bushel they sold for home consumption. In addition to this mischief at home, the price of wheat at a distance also suffered from this very cause, for a depression of the price in one section lowers the price in other sections. All this may be effectually avoided

by the adoption of the proposition under consideration, for the United States Government could at the proper season invite bids from American and foreign ship owners in advance, and competition would bring about the lowest rate, for the ships of the world could not so readily combine.

The same law of cost for transportation and its relation to the net return to the farmer operates precisely the same in the distribution of fruit as it does in wheat, as an example will show.

A New York fruit buyer, for instance, desiring to deliver 500 boxes California peaches in New York at \$3 50 per hundred pounds, and desiring to transport the peaches by passenger time to New York, finds that it costs \$2 50 per hundred pounds to do this, which will pay the grower no more than \$1 a hundred pounds. The grower, in accepting the rate, has fixed \$1 per hundred at which the Sacramento dealer or canner will pay for the same quality (although in the latter case there is no transportation cost to be paid by the home buyer). When this law is once generally understood, the importance and benefit of the proposition herein outlined will be recognized.

And when once recognized, great efforts will be made for its adoption, not alone by the producers, but by all intelligent citizens. It remains now to be seen what the cost would be to the United States Government for officials and employees in carrying out this system in active operation. Many, who were under the impression that it would be very great, will no doubt be surprised to learn that the cost will be trifling compared to the vast amount of good it will do.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE METHOD.

It is only necessary for the Government to issue a shipping receipt, to be adopted by an Act of Congress, and the establishment of an Auditing Department at Washington, and that persons shipping products to come within the scope of the Act use these Government shipping receipts only, duplicates of which the transportation companies forward on to the Government's auditing office at Washington for the collection of the additional amounts due the transportation companies from the Government.

This or a similar mode may be devised, and may conform to the method now in operation between trunk and branch roads of a railroad system. The difference being, that the initial line now collects and distributes the amounts received for freights, but in the case under consideration, the initial line will collect the difference from the Government, and distribute the respective shares to the various companies concerned. And the shipper will ship and receive farm products precisely as he does now, and at the risk of the transportation companies, the only difference being that his rate will be lower. Several hundred efficient employees at a central office at Washington is all the machinery necessary to put this plan in operation, and to continue it, for moving the entire crop of farm products of the United States, for interior and for foreign transportation.

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

I respectfully ask the reader to show any fatal flaw in the table given above, or in the premise argument and conclusion. If the flaw is here the proposition falls to the ground.

Kindly point it out.

If the flaw is not here, we have in this measure a plan for the uplifting of agriculture, hence a method for providing and maintaining a steady demand for labor, hence progress in manufacture and the development of commerce; and, above all, it is the very measure calculated to preserve and perpetuate our republic, and give it that progressive tendency so essential to the happiness of all the people.

For the information of those who are not aware that the price of staple farm products is fixed at Liverpool, and that the rate for transportation modifies that price; and further, that the American consumer does not pay "protection" prices for that which is bought for home consumption, but on the contrary, pays a lesser net price than the Liverpool buyer does, the following questions and answers put to and received from Mr. H. G. Smith (proprietor of the Pioneer Flour mills, Sacramento), are appended:

Q. What rank does your mill hold among the mills of the State? A. Ranks among the first and best in this State.

Q. The price of wheat, where is it fixed? A. In England, or properly, Liverpool.

Q. When a buyer for the Liverpool market desires to buy wheat in California, does he fix his buying price at the Liverpool quotation? A. Yes, of course he does.

Q. Does he not deduct from Liverpool price the cost for transportation from place of purchase to Liverpool? A. Yes.

Q. The home buyer—say, for instance, you buy for your own mill—do you pay any higher than the man does who buys for Liverpool (quality being same) than the Liverpool buyer does after he has deducted the cost for transportation? A. No.

Verified by C. McCreary, for the Sacramento mills. Capacity fully up to the first mills in the State.

CHAPTER XV.

PATERNALISM AND ANTI-PATERNALISM.

The proposition under consideration has been attacked by two radically differing parties, and, for want of a better term, I shall call the one "paternalists" and the other "anti-paternalists." The paternalists vehemently declare that this proposition does not go far enough, that the writer should advocate government ownership of railroads, government banks, free silver, financial reforms, etc. The anti-paternalists have been equally vehement and demonstrative in their objection to the proposition, asserting that any reform in the direction indicated would be paternalism.

TO THE PATERNALISTS.

To the first, I wish to say that I have neither the time nor the inclination to start out in the reform business on general principles. There are able men with more leisure, and plenty of them, for that purpose. I did start out to advocate the proposition under consideration, because I saw in it a practical measure for the

betterment of the conditions of labor, commerce and manufacture, and I believed that its adoption would tend in the direction of progress and in the peace and development of our cherished institutions; and what I believed the need of now, and I am strengthened in that belief more than ever, for the proposition is now in the gauntlet of criticism, and from a numerous critics—some among the ablest of our country—not a single valid objection to the proposition has been offered; and I am inclined to continue in the work until objection does appear, or until this gauntlet is crowned with victory. Let it be right, here that I do not propose to adopt any general scheme of radical politics. The time may come when radical politics may prevail, and let us hope not before all men will be just, wise, honest and brave. To have it come now would be to strike a "knout" at the bidding of a czar.

TO THE ANTI-PATERNALISTS

Now, a word with the anti-paternal object to this proposition because you call it a phase of paternalism. To be a paternalist you must also object to other phases of paternalism which show a phase of paternalism against those which have already been incorporated in our laws and are a part of the institutions of our country. Among these, for instance, is this: The best and highest legal minds of the world have decided that "whenever government under supervision of private contracts and the right of interpreting the same, it is a paternal function;" that "whenever the individual against any abuse in the use of paper money by banks, it is a paternal function;" that "whenever government enacts that certain industries protected by a tariff on imports, it is a paternal function." Now, we hear of a paternalist against the assumption by the government of paternal functions as far as the above are concerned? No; nor would we find any enough to object to them, notwithstanding what I said before, the best and highest judicial minds of the world have decided the assumption of such power by the government is a paternal function.

Do these men not see and understand the assumption by the government of paternal functions, to a degree consistent with the maintenance of peace and a just reciprocity of trade, as the very anchor and safeguard to liberty and tends as a guard and as a restraint against a greater degree of paternalism which would be a great evil?

THE FREE TRADERS.

The free traders, however, are a most consistent objectors to this proposition. But the consistent man is not always right or wise in his consistency. He may hold tenaciously to his idea, but it may be wrong. He says, "If protection is right, then your proposition is also right. If protection is wrong, and, as a result, your proposition is wrong."

"Wrong in what?"

"In this: It takes from my pocket which goes to enrich the manufacturer."

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

his proposition is intended to give
ou an equivalent for your loss."
't want the equivalent, I don't want
ed in the first place; I want protec-
away with."
ee you are not strong enough to have
r, would you refuse an equivalent if
an opportunity of getting it?"
on principle."
ee you are wrong in theory of free
What if free trade was to bring ruin?"
; brought ruin to England?"
nd's condition offers no parallel com-
There the land has been and is the
of aristocrats, and worked by tenants,
e and are content with the most
returns, and labor is compelled to
rate of wages but a shade higher than
on the Continent."
he workman can get more for his
ere than here."
for his money in what, for instance?"
rything."
are certainly mistaken. Can he get
per?"
re are not here to discuss what will
ie workman alone, are we? Are
; other interests here worth looking
des workmen?"
there are other interests, but the con-
they are make it absolutely necessary
be considered as a factor, if not the
pray?"
se he has a vote, and because you are
; without his co-operation."
less! Did we not snow him under
mber?"
r; you did not 'snow him under.'
ed himself under, and he is not likely
himself again in the same manner in

Now let Mr. Freetrader ponder over this somewhat, and in time we may expect him to rally to the only proposition that is likely to afford him an equitable compensation for the loss he is compelled to sustain by protection. Let him patiently wait for free trade to come when the proper time arrives. It may not come before Europe has ceased to be an armed camp, when wages shall not be consumed by millions of idle soldiers, and when Asia and Africa shall be brought up to that pitch of civilization so that the workmen there have trade unions, demanding and receiving wages as high as in the United States. We may expect in the interim, however, while our friend waits, that quite a few missionaries will be cooked and eaten; quite a few million of Bibles given away free; quite a few million of the semi-civilized races have been killed off in battles, we may safely conclude that quite a few centuries may elapse before the conditions will be here for free trade.

As to the opposition to this proposition by those who are protectionists, and are benefited by it, are they not unreasonably inconsistent in their opposition to a proposition that is intended to protect agriculture as well as manufacture? They have not even the excuse of the freetrader, that their opposition is based on a principle, therefore they try to hedge under the word "Paternalism." Is that a just "cry" for them?

Let us not be misled by the radical paternalists or the anti-paternalists; let us adopt that happy medium so essential to the welfare of agriculture and the stability of labor, and we adopt that course which will guarantee the permanence of our Republic, so that freedom and liberty may take up their eternal abode in our midst.

A HISTORY OF THE PROPOSITION.

CHAPTER XVI.

osition as it now stands has not
ved by the writer in an hour, or in a
a year. It is the result of experi-
ervation and close study, which was
1885, as the following newspapers will
acramento Bee, September 17 and Oc-
86; Sacramento Record-Union, October
San Francisco Chronicle, October 21 and
r 6, 1886; San Francisco Alta, October
etc.
r years' experience as a merchant, five
a fruit-grower, and five years as a
lser, has enabled the writer to gather
acts which he would not otherwise
n able to obtain in any one pursuit
these facts brought about a series of
ations crystallizing in the proposition
ed herein. Should the premise argu-
nd conclusions be wrong, there is an
he matter. Present indications, how-
uld go to show that these are not
ut, on the contrary, that they are
or criticisms have come to hand from
tion of the Union, and some foreign
s, and while there is strong opposition
the premise, argument and conclu-
s not yet been refuted.

Those that are of the opinion that, when I say "they have not yet been refuted," I stamp myself as belonging to that class of reformers who once an idea takes possession of them it becomes a hobby, are mistaken, as the following will show:

The promulgating committee is indebted to honest criticism for its changed opinion in the tax clause of the proposition, as originally advocated. Said Mr. M. McGlynn (Secretary Federation Labor Council of San Francisco): "The proposition does not require the free tax clause, for, if farming is made profitable, there will be no chance for building up a system of foreign low-grade renters. Farm wages will then be too high to admit of this being done. This class of renters can only follow if your proposition is not adopted, for then farm wages will decline. If it is adopted, then profits in farming will advance, hence wages will advance, and the low-grade renting system simply becomes impossible. This clause, therefore, is superfluous." The promulgating committee is under the impression that the argument of Mr. McGlynn is correct, hence has eliminated the tax clause from this proposition.

Just as soon as other equally good and sound reasons are given for the elimination of any other portion of the proposition, they shall also be eliminated.

NECESSITY OF ACTION.

Upon invitation, the writer has addressed the Council of Federated Trades at Sacramento, the farmers of Yolo county at Winters, the Federated Trades at San Francisco, the farmers of Placer County at Auburn, and the farmers of Solano county at Dixon. At every meeting there was a good attendance, and much interest in the proposition was manifested, and promulgating committees were appointed. Since then the proposition has been placed before the American Federation of Labor at its convention at Chicago (see page 18), and at the

CHAPTER XVIII.

As long as they will do this we will
their opposition as much as we will
cacy of our friends. Let them un
once for all, that a wise nod, a s
shrug, a stale joke, or words without
are not solid and understandable rea-

We have had a good deal to say, from

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

effect of the current tariff discussion is of labor, because we believe that it is that department that the greatest injury is brought by the threatened change in our tariff. Mr. Gompers, the leader of the American Labor Union, states that there are at least 100,000 unemployed workmen as the direct result of restriction and suspension of manufacturing from the menace of the Willamette number must be greatly increased, and suspensions are in excess of 100,000.

Under that there is but one alternative, a new tariff bill becomes a law, and reduction of the price of labor to meet the tariff schedules. This is not a thing to contemplate, and nothing but a thing of necessity will ever reconcile our men to such an alternative. But hunger conquers pride and stubbornness, and they are getting in its work in that direc-

editorial from the Sacramento Bee, 2, 1894.

Trade journals often state facts regarding workings of free trade with a brutal which must be extremely discouraging somewhat disconcerting to the admirers of the free system in this country. Take this in the London "Iron and Coal Trade" on the subject of American competition in the manufacture of tools and implements. The paper says: "The time has not yet arrived when an American can command as cheap labor as we, but he is coming nearer to that every day, and he is likely to be brought very still by a fall in the tariff duties." It is, and the workmen of the United States who fail to recognize the fact, do not see as clear to them as daylight, the tariff barrier is stricken down they go to work for the same wages paid in other countries. Protectionists have pointed this out, and have sounded a constant note of alarm for years past, but if the people are willing to bend their neck and submit to the rule of the slave drivers of the south wish to impose, the country being a free one, they are wrong.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE INTERESTS OF LABOR.

It therefore appears from the above that the interests of labor can best be preserved by the preservation of the protective tariff, and the rights of organized labor in counteracting the injurious drawbacks caused by the tariff combinations.

This is correct; but only as far as it goes. No other factor to the question which, in itself, slowly, but most surely, neutralizes the safeguards whatsoever. A factor that can be counteracted by the protective tariff. Nor can it be overcome by any other organization. A factor which will do the most vehement coercive measure a strong wind does a feather. That "Distance." Those that have attended to the other portions of this book can hardly fail to note the importance of the tariff, and its bearing and relation to the tariff, and in the history of our country this question has had but a feeble influence in the direction indicated. The reason for this. The development of the great west may be said to have practically begun now. There are men living yet who remember when Chicago was a village; and

our geography of to-day does not show "the great American desert" as prominently as it did thirty years ago. The pioneering days are not, however, altogether of the past. There is more of it going on in a year now than in many years that have gone. And the work of development will continue on uninterruptedly until the task has been accomplished. How it shall be accomplished is a question of grave and serious import to labor and to labor's interest.

DISTANCE.

We are now to consider attentively the fact that no civilized country in the world has such a vast area of territory as ours. That in its development certain economic problems confront us, which to ignore would be dangerous, not alone to the interests of labor, but to the perpetuity of our republican form of government. The problem for solution is this: Development tends in the direction of production and its increase. Originally the pioneer settlers find no such problem of increased production to solve, for the first labor of the pioneer is to gather up the surface wealth of the new country. This "surface wealth" was for the west in its precious metals, minerals, timber, fish, lands, and the fertile richness of its virgin soil. With comparatively little effort these are converted into wealth. Exchange is easily effected by reason of the diversity of interests, and wages are high. In time the "surface wealth" becomes exhausted, and the diversity is gradually changed to a condition of uniformity in production. And this uniformity takes the form in the line of adaptability, and persists in that direction, ultimately resulting in a quantity of production of great volume, tending toward lessened returns. For a time the pressure of the lessened return is bravely met by the producer, who, having in mind the greater return of the past, hopefully looks to the future for the returns of the past. But as the law of increase prevents a realization of his hopes, and beginning at last to realize the true state of affairs, he sees before him but two alternatives: He must either abandon his calling, or lower wages. This condition is already approaching; and we may say right here that, while vineyards and orchards may change hands, they are not abandoned. For as long as the point of least resistance can be had in cheaper labor, it becomes more profitable to employ it than to uproot what to the owner is his fortune.

CHEAP LABOR.

This cheap labor once a necessity becomes a realization; and if coolies are wanted, laws are modified to bring them. And if not these, then others, until the wage rate is reduced to a basis at which the great primary occupation will pay. This generalization is no idle theory, but a fact that any one familiar with the subject can easily verify. Now, apart from the loss to our country in the introduction of a lower civilization, it deals its heaviest blow at the prosperity of labor, especially skilled labor. For as the primary customer of labor in an agricultural country is in the margin of profit to the farmer on his product, and in the vast number of farm hands, when the wages of these have been reduced to a wage at which they can no longer afford to buy skilled-labor goods, then in that event skilled labor has lost one of its

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

most valuable customers. And once lost is seldom, if ever, regained. Nor is this the entire loss, for the difference in a given section between a ten million-dollar pay-roll and a five million-dollar one is not borne alone by the immediate wage earner, but by every other industrial occupation. And here again it is skilled labor that is called upon to suffer the ultimate loss.

There is but one solution to this problem, and that is in the reduction of the cost for transportation of farm products to a rate which will enable the farmer to earn a living and permit him to pay his farm hands fair wages. The higher ratio of reduction to be applied to the distance most remote. And it is herein advocated that this be done through the United States government, and for these reasons:

First—It cannot well be done by any one else

Second—It will be a supplement to the protective tariff, and practically accomplish what the tariff aims to do, but cannot do as long as the condition exists.

Third—Unless it is adopted wages in the entire country must decline, and keep on declining until a minimum has been reached, and on which the tariff and labor union can have no effect.

The factor of distance and its relation to wages is, however, not the only one entering into the issues of the question before us. There are two other phases equally important. One relating to the treatment of staple products, and the other the small package proposition, whereby specified farm products in limited weight and bulk are to be mailable at an even rate for any distance through the United States Postoffice. These are set forth on page 3.

In conclusion, I wish to observe that the proposition treated of in this pamphlet is of such vital importance to labor, that it should not be overlooked by wage earners, and especially by the labor leaders of our country. That it will not be overlooked may be inferred from the following remarks made by M. H. Madden, of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, before the convention of the American Federation of Labor of Chicago:

There has never been such a time for the display of economic genius and the inauguration of a movement for the enfranchisement of labor. Existing conditions must improve if we do our duty. I hold here in my hand a weapon which is all-powerful, not for the destruction, but, properly applied, for the building up of society. It is the priceless ballot of a freeman. I feel that I cannot say too much in urging our people to take interest in public affairs.

The proposition has been heartily indorsed by the Labor Union of this city and San Francisco. It was also presented at the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Chicago, and the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor deem the idea of uniformity of transportation for farm products worthy of consideration, and we refer it to affiliated bodies for discussion.

Below is a portion of a synopsis of the address as contained in the *Daily Inter-Ocean* of Chicago, December 13, 1893:

For the most practical address which has so far been delivered before the convention of the American Federation of Labor was that of David

Lubin, of Sacramento, Cal., who spoke to the convention yesterday afternoon:

Mr. Lubin is a wealthy merchant of this city, and is also largely interested in farming operations in California. He has given much thought to economic questions in the abstract and his long and active experience as a business man has led him to go beyond a mere study of the causes which produce certain effects in the economic world.

The speaker started out with an explanation of how the world's markets had become located where they are. They had been the outgrowth of centuries and dependent upon certain natural laws which no artificial regulations could stay a system. All that could be done was to so modify these laws as to make civilization possible when otherwise it would not be.

Mr. Lubin maintained that what had made the Russian serf, the Indian pariah and the South American peon was their remoteness from the world's markets. The cost of transporting the products of their toil to the place where it could be exchanged for the necessities which they wished in return.

To bring his argument home to the people of the United States the speaker took the case of California and the other States on the Pacific slope. He said:

These States have furnished the most remunerative market for labor of any country in the world for the past forty years, and why? During that time those States, through their diversity of interests, have been able to furnish a home market to its producers. The farmer was able to sell his products to the miner, the lumberman, the fisherman, and the manufacturer with small loss in the cost of transportation. There was consequently in such a prolific country good return to all the people engaged in all kinds of production, and consequently good wages.

NEW CONDITIONS EVOLVED.

With the development of this country the tendency has been to evolve the lines of production upon which the country must ultimately depend for its source of wealth. These productions are fruit and grain. In the case of fruit for awhile the producer was enabled to obtain high prices because of the lack of competition, but as the country became better settled up competition came from within and prices fell to a point at which the element of transportation began to encroach upon the profits of the producer.

The situation has now resolved itself to this: Either transportation rates must give way or the rate of wages must fall. You may naturally inquire what has all this to do with organized labor? I answer it has everything to do with you. Unless fair profits are made by the producer, good wages cannot be paid to the farm laborer. If he gets low wages he cannot buy the finer manufactured products, and the result is your skilled Eastern mechanic soon finds himself out of employment.

A trades unionist told me: "Oh, we are not interested in the farm laborer; we can maintain high wages by organization." I said to him, and say to you, unless the farmers of the country are prosperous you cannot maintain high wages. Low prices of produce, or what is the same thing a small margin of profit, means the lowering of wages. We feel this influence in California already. Competition and the great cost of transportation have already cut down the margin of profit to the producer to a point where the wage earner has begun to feel it. There was a time in our history when the farm hand received \$1 per day and his find during ordinary seasons, and \$2 per day during harvest. Now the wage rate is \$25 per month, and \$1.50 per day during harvest. This winter will see wages go still lower.

THE LIMIT OF POWER IN ORGANIZED LABOR.

You say organize and keep wages up. I say

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

cannot do anything of the kind. You must eliminate the law which produces these things, or, by heaven, your union will be eliminated. If you undertake to stand in the way of workings of such a law you will be brushed from the path of progress. You ask me propose to remedy the law. I will tell you, government must necessarily always be paid in its operation. We must put a tariff on products of other countries and use the fund so for the equalization of the inequalities exist among our own people. I am not an advocate of the government ownership of railroads, because it involves a greater expenditure of money than we can afford in the first instance; because it also involves a serious political issue in extending the powers of the party in power; and, lastly, it is an innovation and subject to the uncertainties and delays encountered in attempting any entirely new scheme into practice, on the other side of the question. We have the machinery of the government in tested order for the collection of tariff duties. We are loath to the idea of governmental aid in its various forms. We give pensions to the disabled who fought our battles; we improve our harbors and put up public buildings for the public good; we make special rates for the shipment of certain articles of merchandise through the mails at a rate below the actual cost of transportation. All these things are done for the public good and the people thoroughly understand the workings of the system. Then why do we not this same system be extended to attain an equality of profits on production throughout the country. The money saved by means of a tariff on imports which

falls equally or nearly so upon the people of the whole country? The money which would be paid to equalize rates of transportation would eventually return to the people who paid the tariff tax to raise it and no injustice would be done in the end.

HOW THE SCHEME WILL WORK.

To illustrate my idea, suppose the government should by investigation establish an equitable rate of transportation between San Francisco and New York as it does in the matter of postal charges, and then should say to the California shipper I will allow you a rebate out of the national treasury of say 50 or 60 per cent on that rate. To the Denver shipper allow a proportional rebate and so on at points nearer and nearer market. The California producer would then be placed on an equal footing with his eastern brother and the California laborer would receive a fair wage rate for his work. This would react so as to furnish a better market for the manufactured product of the eastern factory and consequent better wages to the eastern skilled workman. What I have said applies equally to the producer anywhere.

Without some such system we will gradually tend toward the pauper wages of Europe. In my opinion it is the vital question of the day, and unless your organization takes up such problems and makes a study of them it will not only fail of its true purpose, but must soon sink into insignificance.

Mr. Lubin's remarks were frequently applauded and at the close the convention extended him a vote of thanks.

TO THE FARMERS.

CHAPTER XX.

Shortly after the distribution of the first numbers of letters of encouragement from farmers to me, and from every section of the country. These now fill several boxes, and continue to come to hand. It was the original intention to publish these letters (or as many of them as space would permit) in this edition. Due deliberation it was deemed more advisable to publish in this issue those from opponents, rather than from those in favor, and the prominent manufacturers, merchants, and economists, etc., rather than from the farmers. The views of farmers will be given in another issue.

The encouraging tenor of the letters received has induced me to issue the present edition.

The accomplishment of practical results, however, rests altogether with the farmers themselves. Of one thing they can rest assured: Unless they exert the power necessary for accomplishment, they need not expect anyone else to do it for them.

When the book publishers desired to send a copy by the ton through the United States at one cent a pound, they did not go to about it, but they exerted all their power to bring the law passed. And if the farmers desire legislation, they must also exert effort in order to succeed, and unless they do so pamphlet distribution that may be done is so much wasted time and means. There be education, agitation and organization.

CAN IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?

The present indications it would appear

that no other question of equal importance has a greater chance of practical realization than the proposition advocated. There is no other question that appeals so strongly to the self-interest, not alone of the farmer, but to the workingman. When millions of idle workmen can so readily trace the causes of enforced idleness to the lack of a sufficient margin of profit to the farmer—when the wage rate has a downward tendency which can only be improved as the margin becomes greater for the farmer—it will not be a difficult task for the farmer to obtain the assistance and co-operation of the workingmen in furthering the advancement of this proposition to a successful issue. In other words, if the farmers want it, they can have it, but not unless they exert the necessary energy. Associations should be formed, and promulgating committees should be appointed, and stated meetings for discussions and action should be held. And affiliations should take place with neighboring organizations, and a national central organization should be effected.

Now is the time for action.

To the Farmers of the Southern States.

CHAPTER XXI.

It is evident to the observing that the time has gone by when free trade, as a political issue, can be advanced in the hope of practical results. If ever there was a chance for practical results toward free trade within the past thirty years, that chance centered in the present administration. So far, no attempt has been made by this administration for free

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

trade. On the contrary, pressure is being brought to bear to continue the McKinley tariff in force, rather than the passage of the Wilson bill. And a great part of this pressure comes from the Southern States. The Wilson bill itself, as a whole, is scarcely less rigorous in its protective policy than was the McKinley bill, as the following dispatch from Washington to the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* of December 12th will show:

The Wilson tariff bill is to be made the subject of protest from unexpected quarters. A number of Democrats have given notice that when the measure shall be introduced in the House it will be opposed by them.

It is reported that that noted apostle of free trade, Harter, of Ohio, has interested himself to secure a greater measure of protection for manufacturing interests in his district.

Where can we find a "noted apostle" of free trade that is not in favor of protecting "his own district?"

WILSON BILL, AS AMENDED.

The changes which are made in the tariff bill since it was given to the public two weeks ago, are as follows:

Velvet and tapestry, velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets and carpeting of like character or description, increased from 25 to 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Tapestry Brussels carpets, plain or figured, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, increased from 25 to 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Triple ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets increased from 25 to 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Wool and two-ply ingrain carpets from 20 to 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Felt carpeting, figured or plain, from 20 to 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Saxony, Wilton, and Towmay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpeting of like character, from 25 to 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed of part of either not specially provided for in this act, from 20 to 25 per cent. ad valorem.

The following has been added to the wood schedule and taken from the free list:

Lumber of any sort, planed or finished for each side; planed or finished, 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, \$1 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and if planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, \$1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule, no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonging, and grooving.

Collodion to 45 per cent. ad valorem. Feathers increased from 25 to 35 cents per pound.

Malt increased from 20 to 25 per cent. Chocolate confectionery inserted at 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Champagne restored to present rates. Twine of hemp increased from 10 to 30 per cent. ad valorem. Oil cloth from 20 to 25 per cent.

Laces, edgings, embroideries, inserting, neck ruffling, ruchings, trimmings, tuckings, lace window curtains, and other similar tamboured articles and articles embroidered by hand or machinery, embroidered or hemstitched handkerchiefs, and articles made wholly or in part by lace, ruffings, tuckings, or ruchings, from 35 per cent. to 40 per cent.

Burlaps added to dutiable list at 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Brushes and feather dusters increased from 25 to 30 per cent.

Jewelry, 25 to 35 per cent.

But retired hog-butchers or stock-brokers may have:

Original drawings and sketches, and artists' proofs of etchings and engravings, and statuary of wood, added to free list.

CHAPTER XXII.

IF NOT FREE TRADE, WHAT?

If these changes in the tariff point to free trade, I confess I fail to see it.

One fact has, however, been demonstrated, and that is: whichever political party gains the ascendancy, it will make no difference as to the outcome, and that outcome we are now justified in saying is in the direction of a protective tariff.

The schedule may be changed, some articles raised, some lowered, but, as a whole, the product that remains is protection.

In view of this fact, it behooves every Southern planter producing staple products to carefully examine the proposition set forth in this pamphlet, especially that portion wherein it is proposed that the Government pay back to the producers of staple farm products, either in part or a sum equivalent to the amount paid out of the pockets of the producers for protection. (See Classification Three, p.p. 3, 7.) At no time in the history of the Union was there a more opportune time for favorable action on any political proposition than there is on the proposition advocated herein. For not alone will the farmers of the United States favor it, but the workmen, too, have signified their willingness to do likewise.

STAPLE FARM PRODUCTS AND PROTECTION.

Just as long as the staple farm products of the country earned sufficient to pay for protection and buy manufactured goods, no one seemed inclined to look too closely into the justice of the matter. But when the laborers in the cheapest labor countries of the world have been enabled to produce the same staples—by reason of the recent introduction among them of modern agricultural tools, implements and machinery—at a price which, while to them profitable, means a loss to the American producer, and manufacturers, merchants and workmen, having learned by recent sad experience that when the farmer has no margin of profit that the factory must close its doors, and the workman go idle; that reduced consumption of manufacture must reduce the rate of wages and lengthen the hours of labor. When all this has been experienced, it will be no difficult task to carry a measure which calls for a return of a portion of the amount paid out by the producers of staple farm products back into the pockets where it came from, in order that the factory door may be reopened, and the rate of wages maintained.

IS IT A FAVOR?

When the producers of staple farm products ask for this, they are not asking for any present or favor; they are asking for a portion of that which they are compelled to pay out and do not receive in return. It is a right, a just right, and not a favor or bonus. And no right will be more cheerfully granted than this one, provided proper efforts be made to obtain it.

A much lesser effort will, however, be required to win success in this direction than for free trade.

The matter is now left in the hands of those in whose interest it was submitted, and if, after due deliberation, they choose to have it adopted, they can have it so, by exerting the proper effort. The question now remains: "Will this effort be made?"

The Rate of Wages in Manufacturing Centers and Its Relation to the Margin of Profit Made by Farmers.

LABOR LEADERS.

much of its land under cultivation, produces farm products. Her farm products are, however, insufficient to feed her people, and she is therefore, obliged to buy food from other countries, which she does, and gives in exchange her manufactures. In other words, England imports agricultural products and exports manufactures. The primary industry of England is, therefore, agriculture, and the secondary is manufactures. The United States, however, imports manufactures, and exports agricultural products, therefore the primary industry of this country is agriculture, and the secondary is manufactures. Taking this for granted, we will now proceed to lay down the following rules:

First—The Margin of Profit of the Primary Industry Is the Source for the Supply of the Secondary Industry.

**Second—The Volume of the Former
mines the Latter.**

Agriculture being the primary industry in this country, it must furnish from its surplus the source for the demand of skilled-labor goods. When that profit is fair, there follows a fair demand for skilled-labor. But when that profit is small, there must follow a corresponding decrease for goods and labor.

There is not a storekeeper in the country who does not know that. They know it from actual experience, for it is no uncommon thing to hear them remark "business is very bad" because the farmers have not made much money this year."

Now, as soon as working men will be realize that the storekeeper is really ar of labor, holding temporarily the prod labor until in demand by the farmer, th begin to realize the importance to them storekeeper's remarks: "Business is ver because the farmers have, not made this year." They will also realize wha tion the profits of the farmer his the purchase of the products of his then working men will begin to that the purchasing power for the p of their labor can be no greater th profits of the farmer. When they can realize this, they will from that ti prepared to indorse this proposition soon as they can realize that certain tions (spoken of in this pamphlet) ha evolved, that tend in the direction of a s lowering of that profit, hence in a lesser mand for labor, and that the prop herein advocated will tend in a large n to offset these conditions. As soon a can realize this, they will become ad for it.

for it. If the premise argument and conclusion are wrong, then in that event there is an error in the matter. If, however, these are correct, then in that event the duty on the part of labor in the indirect assistance to agriculture is in the direct labor by must result in a direct laboring assent to the correct

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

premise, argument and conclusion of this proposition, will there be found a sufficient number of labor leaders who will interest themselves in a work like this?

I do not know, but if I did not so believe I would not have devoted so much time to convince them, besides, at the present time, among the most zealous advocates for this proposition are quite a number of working men.

I feel, however, that in setting forth the proposition as I have, that I have but done a small share of the work necessary towards its accomplishment. The great work of promulgation and adoption must remain with the people. And in their hands I now leave the matter, believing that if there is sufficient merit in the proposition to warrant action that action will be had.

A CORRESPONDENT asks these questions: "Suppose wheat is selling in Liverpool at \$1 and in California at 80 cents, the 20 cents difference representing cost of transportation; suppose

the United States was to pay 15 cents in the lowering of the freight rate, would not increased production again lower the price? And in that event would not the benefits of reduction inure to England?" No; because the United States is not the only wheat exporting country in the world. The wheat product of the whole world would have to increase, before any material reduction could take place. Again, as the exports from this country is only about one-quarter of the production—three-quarters of the total crop being consumed at home—the wheat grower would receive the advanced price at home as well as for that exported. Besides, any increase in acreage at home must correspondingly increase the demand for labor in this and all other industries, hence there must follow an increase of home consumers at the advanced price. Were the United States the only exporters of wheat in the world, and were it necessary to export nearly all the wheat raised in this country, the correspondent would be correct. As it is he is not.

OPINIONS AND COMMENTS.

In a communication dated November 22d, from Professor PETRIE, of the Victoria Institute and Philosophical Society of Great Britain, London, he states that he will bring this proposition before the attention of the society, and adds in conclusion: "I have always held that the staples of a country was its agriculture. When agriculture does not flourish, it is to the injury of the state."

Opinion of MESSRS. LEVI WECHSLER & Co., manufacturers of shirts, New York:

There exists no remedy, as far as we can see, for overproduction, whether it is wheat, cotton, fruit, or any merchandise whatsoever; prices will rule low as long as the supply exceeds the demand, and no artificial means, even when supported by the government, can regulate the world's markets.

There is to-day an oversupply of labor in Europe that can make shirts. The United States Government puts up a tariff on the European shirts, and this prevents shirtmakers from being compelled to work for from 25 to 50 "kreutzers" per day as they do in Austria. You see there is a way to square the shirtmakers. The shirtmakers, however, are squared at the expense of wheat and cotton growers; this is neither just nor equitable. That, however, did not seem to matter until the time has arrived when it has got to matter for wheat and cotton produced below cost at the expense of shirt and other manufactures will soon leave shirtmakers without orders, and with risky accounts, and labor will have to come down to a figure much greater than the indirect tax would amount to were this plan herein advocated adopted.

Opinion of HON. J. L. THOMAS, Assistant Attorney-General, U. S. Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.:

I scarcely think the proposition practicable or desirable. It involves, however, a great big question, and I have not studied it sufficiently to be able to give an opinion as to the practical results of the plan. What often seems sound in theory proves to be fallacious to a pernicious degree when put to the practical test.

True, but not always so. Hence the last clause of your opinion may not be taken as an axiom. We can as truthfully say: "What often seems sound in theory proves to be advantageous in a high degree when put to the practical test."

Opinion of MILLER, HALL & HARTWELL, manufacturers of white shirts, Troy, N. Y.:

The government would be creating fictitious values, which it should have no right to do.

Does not the government create fictitious values on shirts by the protective tariff? How long could your industry continue at the rate of wages it is paying if similar goods were permitted to come into our ports free of duty from Germany and Austria? Cannot a German or an Austrian make shirts in their country as well as the labor your industry employs can make them here? They certainly can and at a mark (24 cents) a day in Germany and at 50 kreutzers (20 cents) a day in Austria. Now what would become of our manufacturing interests were free trade to obtain? What would prevent wages from being lowered to the German and Austrian rates? Nothing. And yet our wage rate is only maintained by reason of the tariff, and this very tariff which supports your industry creates a fictitious value on

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

shirts, which the producer of staples is compelled to pay for or go without them, whereas you and your workpeople can freely buy the staple farm products from the producer at Liverpool prices.

Has, then, the government a right to protect your interest and not that of the farmer of staple products? Is the interest you represent of more importance to the welfare and perpetuity of this republic than that of agriculture? What is it that best tends to conserve a republic? Is it flourishing manufacturing interests and with agricultural interests declining? Is it not best conserved when both flourish? How then can you expect the producers of staple products to prosper when he is compelled to sell his products at the world's market price, and then pay protected wages, and protection prices? Your interests can not do it and live, neither can the farmer do it. And as a result, while all other interests accumulate wealth, the farmer accumulates mortgages. While in other interests the principals may retire from business with a fortune, the farmer is retied by a foreclosure.

Shall this state of affairs continue indefinitely? Can it continue without imperiling the existence of our republic? There are said to be 3,000,000 idle workpeople in the United States. What is the cause of their idleness? Why are they idle? Because they have no work. Why have they no work? Because there is a financial panic, because silver has been demonetized, because there is a scarcity of circulating medium, because—

Nonsense! They are idle because merchants do not buy enough goods, and they do not buy because there is no demand. There is no demand because the farmers made no money. Let the cotton growers of the south and the wheat growers of the west say what profits they realized on their crops, and then we will know right quickly why there are three million idle men. The low price on staple farm products are not here for a season only; they have come to stay. The fahlah, the ryot, the coolie, and the mujik no longer scrapes the ground with a stick, for they have been supplied with agricultural implements of the most modern and approved make. And these, when once adopted, are never abandoned. Shall we then abandon farming because we cannot compete with the cheap labor of the semi-civilized countries? Shall we all become shirt makers, barbers, clergymen, or bankers? With what will we pay for our imports when our exports of staple farm products decline? If in manufactures, our wages would have to decline to a rate that would enable us to underbid the pauper labor of Europe. If in gold, where would we get it from?

There is but one course in the direction of prosperity, and that course is consistent with justice and good policy. If it is in the best interests of this republic to protect manufacture, then it is also in the best interest to protect agriculture. The sooner this is done the better. As a method for the accomplishment of this purpose, the proposition is advocated to have the United States government appropriate, out of the funds which it collects for protection, and pay the same out as a rebate on the transportation of farm products.

In conclusion, Messrs. Miller, Hall & Hart well say:

It would greatly upset values of farm lands enhancing the value of lands in remote sections of the country, and depressing the values of land near large cities; enriching the owner of the one and impoverishing the owner of the other, and the holders of mortgages upon the depressed values would have to foreclose, and perhaps be unable to obtain the amount of the mortgage, and therefore injure the holder thereof, and ruin the farmer.

While it would enhance the lands in remote sections, it will not depreciate the value of lands near the large cities, because the value of the lands near large cities depends upon the prosperity of those large cities. And if farming is rendered more prosperous in the remote districts, it will greatly benefit the large cities and tend to increase the wage earners there in a ratio equal to the increased prosperity. This will increase and not diminish the value of the lands near large cities, therefore proving benefit and not a loss.

Opinion of MR. EUGENE V. DESS, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Terre Haute, Indiana:

It indicates a worthy purpose to find, if possible, a solution to the various vexed problems relating to labor, wages, the distribution of wage and the general betterment of conditions, which must, in all cases, precede reforms.

Opinion of PROFESSOR JOHN C. SCHWAB, of the Yale University, New Haven, Conn.:

I agree with you in believing that, if the United States Government is right in taxing me to enable my neighbor, a cotton spinner, or a coal miner or a ship builder, or an owner of iron works, to do a better business than he otherwise could do, then the government can also fairly tax me to enable my countrymen in California to get more for his wheat crop than he otherwise could, by furnishing him with transportation for less than it costs the government. But I do not think it any concern of the government's to legislate so that I have to support any of my fellowmen. If it were, I might fairly ask that the government pass a law that the rest of the country should be taxed so that my salary could be doubled; surely my profession, that of a teacher, needs encouragement and help, as much as any other. We teachers contribute to the welfare of the country fully as much as the iron man, and the coal man and the ship builder, and the farmer; and why should not we get a share of the country's bounty?

Never having been a professor at the Yale University, I am unable to determine what salaries professors receive there. I should judge, however, that they receive as much, at least, as a good floorwalker in a large dry good store, and that is about \$2,000 a year. Now it is safe to say that a professor of like ability will receive about 2,000 gulden in Austria. Am I correct? If I am, then the question remains, how is it that professors receive so high a salary in the United States, and such a low one in Europe? It may be safely answered that professors' salaries are high in the United States because the government has a high protective tariff. This tariff keeps millions of

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

people at profitable work, which tends to create a demand for learning. The demand for learning creates a demand for professors. The supply of good professors being limited, they are paid a salary mutually advantageous to the University and to the professor. We may therefore conclude that professors receive a salary of \$2,000 a year in place of 2,000 gulden because our government has a protective tariff. Professors are therefore protected. They thus "receive a share of the country's bounty."

Now, where does this "bounty" come from? The government, first of all, collects it on whatever merchandise enters its ports, thereby advancing the price to the consumer. That is one source. By far the greater source, however, is in the home manufacture; here the vast number of workmen, the manufacturer, the jobber, the retailer, the transportation company, and many more besides come in for their share. Now then, who is it that actually pays for all this advance? Any one whom we can discover in an industry who is compelled to pay for protection, but who is compelled to sell his production at free trade prices. This is correct, is it not? Now does not the producer of staple farm products pay for protection? Certainly. Is he not compelled to sell his products at home and for export at the Liverpool quotations? Yes. The producer of staple farm products is, therefore, the only industrial worker in the United States who is compelled to labor under this disadvantage, is he not? If you grant that, you must grant that he pays out of his pocket for every penny of protection in the United States. Granting that also, we must conclude that professors' salaries ought to be 2,000 gulden, but the government of the United States compels the producers of staples to advance the difference out of his pocket so as to increase the salary to \$2,000. This is a happy condition for professors, but is, to say the least, an unfortunate predicament for the producer of staples. It is certainly not just nor equitable.

Personal advantage may so blind an individual or a multitude by self-interest that they fail to examine into the equity of that which they believe benefits them. The time has, however, come, when self-interest leans in the direction of equity, and if not for equity's sake, then for safety's sake.

England and Englishmen, in order to obtain the food they need at the cheapest cost of production in the world, has placed modern and improved agricultural implements into the hands of the cheapest field labor workers in the world. This has steadily reduced products until there is no longer a margin of profit sufficient for the maintenance of the American producer, his family, or his hired help. This condition will be permanent as long as the condition causing it continues in force. If it be permanent, it is likely to undermine and destroy the independent tillers of the soil. And when these are destroyed, the republic is doomed. What more just, more equitable, more patriotic, than to give back to the producer of staples, the portion taken from him by compulsion? And as there appears to be no other way, at the present time, to accomplish this than by reducing the cost of transportation, the proposition, as set forth on pages 8 to 8, is therefore submitted.

Opinion of MR. L. ROTHSCHILD, of R child Bros. & Co., button manufacturers, York:

My opinion on this proposition is that it is entirely impracticable as long as the railroad is not owned by the government.

Government ownership of railroads and proposition advocated are two separate questions. The government ownership of rail involves a series of questions, serious in nature, with regard to the permanency of republic in its present form. Eight hundred thousand employes cannot so readily be taken on to the government without materially strengthening centralization of power. Centralization of power is not conducive to welfare and perpetuity of a republic. Even this was not so, the financial difficulties in way of government purchase of all the roads are so great as to make that proposition impracticable.

Mr. Rothschild further says:

A uniform rate of freight would wipe out the merchants in the country and create you wish to prevent—monopoly. A few large concerns in New York, San Francisco would do the business at lower prices than inland dealer could furnish, and do away all middlemen.

Mr. Rothschild is evidently under the impression that the proposition is intended to carry merchandise. If that is so, he is taken. Farm products in their natural state are to be carried, and nothing else.

Opinion of COL. JOHN H. WEBBER, ex-commissioner of Immigration of the Port of York, New York:

His answer to the charge that his theory is plainly in the direction of class legislation is to be that the farmer fails to receive his fair share of the benefits of the protective policy. He should get it in some other way, and that way is the one laid down in the pamphlet referred to. Without even pointing out how the farmer receives protection benefits, directly and indirectly, I desire to call attention to the difference that one protects our people against adverse conditions existing abroad, and Mr. Lubin's idea to protect a certain class of our people against adverse conditions existing at home.

The reader would be likely to infer that Webber could have pointed out, were he so inclined, how the producer of staple farm products receives protection, but did not deem necessary to do so, believing, perhaps, that is a fact so well known that it required no explanation.

But the question remains: Is it a fact?

Do the buyers of cotton or wheat for consumption pay a fraction of a penny for these products than do the export buyers? No. Do not both home and foreign buyers buy the American products at the Liverpool quotations? Yes. The Liverpool quota being a world price, the products, being so that price, sell at free-trade prices? Then, is the producer of staple farm products protected? We have a tariff on wheat. But of what use is a tariff on exports? Webber draws our attention to the difference which in his opinion exists between man-

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

tures and staple farm products; manufacture is protected "against adverse conditions abroad," and that this proposition endeavors to protect staple farm products "against adverse conditions existing at home."

In reply, I wish to state that there is no difference whatever; that the adverse conditions on manufacture, as well as on staple farm products, are from abroad.

I cannot see why a producer of hats or cutlery deserves protection against the German or Austrian producer, and a producer of farm staples is denied the same privilege against the Indian, Russian or Egyptian. If anyone needs protection the most, it is the one whose competition is against the cheapest labor of the world.

Continuing, Col. Webber says:

In any change of economic policies existing conditions must be regarded as factors in the calculation, and if it be intended to brush away the advantage of relative proximity to markets to which the great business interest of a mighty people have adjusted themselves through a long series of years, by eliminating space or annihilating distance, and at the same time requiring from us our share of the cost of the process, we should have to devise some way to tax your "eternal summer," and neutralize the advantages with which nature has blessed California.

There is no necessity "to invent some way to tax our eternal summer." It is taxed enough already. It is taxed by the tariff; it is taxed by labor unions; it is taxed by combinations, and is neutralized by the "eternal summers" of the cheap labor countries who produce the same product.

In addition to all this there is the tax for distance. It is this tax which prevents the development of this great State and of the West. It is this factor which brings about a condition of starving workmen in the East, and thousands of tons of rotting food here.

Remove this barrier, and there will be work for the East and food, too, to feed them with.

With regard to taking existing conditions into consideration and their relation to economic policy, that has received due consideration, and the conclusion arrived at is that there is but one difficulty in the way in the adoption of this proposition, and that is not an economic condition, neither. It is the prejudice of preconceived notions. "It has not been done before, hence it need not be done now." "No one else has done it, therefore we should not." No, no one else has, and because they have not is the reason why those furthest from the market end by having a lower civilization. Is there no difference between the civilization of Turkestan and England? Place London in Turkestan, and give her the same political advantages, and wages will go up to the English standard.

Turkestan is no further from London than is San Francisco from New York. And in time, as the products in this State increase in volume, and, therefore, lower in price, and, unless the cost of transportation is correspondingly reduced, the result must be in a reduction of wages, and in the employment of coolies. We will, therefore, level downward toward the condition of Turkestan. Such are economic conditions, when left to work on their "own hook." Am I drawing on my imagination?

tion? Not at all. The wage rate of the South is an example. Ask the Northern hat, shoe, clothing, cigar or hardware manufacturer what volume of his "skilled labor" goods he sells (per capita) to the Southern and to the Western trade, and you may be surprised at the results. Compare the number of school-houses and illiterate persons in both sections, and note the difference. And yet, with the cheapest field labor in the Union, the Southern planter is unable to make a decent margin of profit on his staple farm products. Why? Because modern agricultural implements have recently been placed in the hands of still cheaper labor in other sections of the world. The time has come when the agricultural interests must have relief, relief from distance and an equation on the amount paid for the protective tariff. If this is not granted, the end must show a lower wage rate, or the destruction of agriculture as a following by a independent yeomanry.

REV. F. MASON NORTH, D.D., General Secretary of the N. Y. City Mission and Church Extension Society of New York, in a communication of December 6, 1893, says:

I have long believed that in so extended a territory as our own where distributing centers are sure to increase in importance and to withdraw from large sections the neighborhood market, some general measure must be devised for distributing the costs of transportation. Thus far it would seem the restriction placed upon the railroads in such acts as the Interstate Commerce law, and by the State regulation, in charter and special legislation, have not served largely the interests of the farmer class. Your suggestion is very radical, but appeals to an one who is favorably disposed toward community control of what concerns the community as such without committing myself to the proposed plan, as could not do without longer and closer investigation. I am glad to express my deep interest in your study and I sincerely hope you will continue to agitate the subject, and shall be desirous of knowing the result of your discussions.

Opinion of Mr. D. M. EHRLICH, Secretary Galveston Cotton and Woolen Mills, Galveston, Texas:

The agricultural interests of this country are paramount in importance, compared to others.

This is correct. Mr. Ehrlich further says:

The tariff and financial questions should be eliminated entirely from political party strife and nothing ought to influence the people of this country to permit the transportation issue "to enter political discussion."

You have failed to give reasons why the important questions you name should be eliminated from political discussion.

Opinion of Dr. J. H. C. BONTE, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.:

Mr. Lubin's statements are plausible and may be well founded. The end sought is extremely desirable. The agricultural life of a people is the womb from which all forms of social life come and there can be no true political economy that does not have its root and vitality in that basis of existence. It is to be hoped that Mr. Lubin will

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

continue his studies, that others will assist in giving momentum to his thoughts. By-and-by light will dawn and men will know what to do—what not to do. This proposition must submit to the natural course of elimination and development.

Opinion of MR. H. E. WELCHER, of H. E. Welcher & Co., manufacturer of ladies' underwear, Rochester, N. Y.:

Some economists claim that we are not suffering from over-production but under-consumption, but we are not to argue this phase of the question.

Why not? Whenever wages decline there is then brought about the condition spoken of as "over-production." Why? Because the lessened wage rate reduces the purchasing power. Less goods are bought, the stock on hand does not diminish at the normal ratio, because there are not enough buyers. This has a tendency to lower the price, thereby lowering wages still more. And this downward tendency would continue on in its course unless arrested by an advance in wages, which advance, as a general rule, comes from the profits of the primary industry (agriculture) and seldom from the secondary (manufacture). Unless in a country where manufacture is the main product for export for in that event manufacture is the primary industry. Thus, if the primary industry be manufacture in that event the opening of new foreign markets at profitable rates brings with it the necessary demand for labor, resulting in increased wages, which diminishes the stock on hand at home. When, however, the primary industry is agriculture, there must be a rise in the foreign market before over-production is counterbalanced.

Now, the primary industry of a country is that which it exchanges with other countries. England, for instance, is a manufacturing country, because its exports are manufactures and its imports are agricultural products.

The primary industry of the United States is agriculture, because we export agricultural products and import manufactures, or what is the same thing, we import by proxy—by the protective tariff (which permits us to manufacture our imports at home.)

It would, therefore, seem that wages and production is governed in this country almost altogether by the volume of the net return on agriculture.

As this net return is lessened, there must necessarily follow the condition called over-production or under-consumption. The net return on staple agricultural products has been steadily decreasing for some time past, and the reason why over-production or under-consumption has not been felt before now is that the farmer has provided himself with an artificial substitute in lieu of the necessary net return in the form of loans by mortgaging his property. A continuation in the decrease of the foreign price of his products must ultimately not alone injure the farmer, but to a corresponding degree injure labor and commerce. Were the cause in the decline of his product a temporary one, we could hope that time would rectify matters. But as the cause

of his former superiority consisted in the superiority of the tools and implements employed in cultivation, and whereas his competitors used the primitive devices of centuries. When now the very inventiveness of this country has been placed by E into the hands of those whose wage rate is cheapest in the world in order to supply with food and raw material at the lowest for production. When all this has been done, we cannot hope for any permanent advance in products which new inventions tend to lower.

Under these conditions the farmer would find it absolutely impossible not alone to progress, but equally impossible to maintain his ground unless there is a change in the terms of protection.

He must either have absolute and unlimited free trade, or he must receive a portion of the money back again which he pays for protection. Free trade would so demoralize the condition of labor as to seriously damage the safety and perpetuity of this republic.

Besides which, even if it were possible to out serious consequences would not be able, for with free trade there would be no reason why the standard of wages in the States would be any higher than in Europe even as high with this country as a competitor for the markets of the world.

If we are to have protection, then we must not have it at the expense of agriculture cause to have it thus is to perpetrate robbery besides as shown above it is neither wily nor profitable.

And the proposition herein advocated is out a method how an adjustment may be arrived at whereby agriculture may receive its measure of justice it is entitled to.

Mr. Welcher further says:

We have the bare fact before us that the land and crops are full to overflowing, yet there is distress in the land and the wheels of business are clogged. Can we remedy it?

Certainly, by the adoption of the proposition advocated in this pamphlet.

NEW YORK, 216 Church Street

December 19, 18

D. LUBIN, Esq., Sacramento, Cal.

DEAR SIR:—We are in receipt of your pamphlet on transportation of agricultural products and have perused its columns carefully. We highly appreciate the cause you have undertaken and would like to see it go into effect, believing it would be beneficial to every farmer in the States, and that the farming industry would rapidly increase, thereby opening up agricultural lands now lying idle, drawing from the cities people who would make for themselves dependent and happy homes.

GLADSTONE MFG. CO.
E. H. Colman,

Opinion of DR. GUSTAVE DIERCKX, Professor of Political Economy, Steglitz, Germany (translation):

I read the little pamphlet, which you sent with much interest, and desire to make the following few remarks: Mr. Lubin is correct in recognizing in the protection of agriculture the United States one of the main remedies

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

the country of the present crisis which the world is passing. The nature of the soil in the United States has made agriculture the most important industry of the country, and it is mainly on the same that the United States has secured the high position it occupies among the nations of the civilized world. It is, therefore, the duty of all politicians and true patriots to insist on establishing plans which will make agriculture profitable. Mr. Lubin is, however, in error when he considers as the only causes of the

First, the competition of cheap foreign second, high freight rates. I agree with him that both are obstacles and an injury to our agriculture, but not the only ones, nor main ones. From the history of American agriculture it can readily be proven that the over-land speculation, to an almost insane degree, has done the greatest amount of injury, because the art of farming has not been understood. However, I will leave this question now, as a discussion of the same would be equivalent to the length of a book. It will require much work and before the opposition to these ideas can be overcome, even here in Germany, and as far as the United States is concerned, I fear the work required about this reform would be a hopeless

The question would effect value of railroad stock held in the United States, as well as in foreign countries; fluctuations of the same to a downward tendency would surely be accompanied by serious results to the credit of the country. Finally, the railroad systems of the United States are not concentrated, hence the numerous interests opposed to each other would make it impossible to introduce this reform with any degree of success.

Dr. Diercks will be pleased to remember we have two things here by which we can accomplish much that is impossible to be accomplished elsewhere, he would no doubt modify the pessemistic tendency toward the close of an excellent article. As Dr. Diercks has threatened us on subjects in Germany, I do mind telling him what these two things are. The first is the ballot, and the second is "dog" tenacity; and both are effective in their respective way.

Opinion of W. G. BRACKETT, of Lilly Brackett & Co., manufacturers of shoes, Brockton, Massachusetts:

Now the strength and wealth of our country is based in its agricultural interests, which should be protected and encouraged to their fullest extent, but as our government can go into closer relations with them without prejudice to its well being in other respects it is a matter that requires more careful thought than can give it. If Republicans and Democrats exist as parties, and parties and politics could be eliminated from this and all other economic questions their solution would be much easier. The government now has hundreds of thousands of employees, whether it would be wise to increase this force fold or tenfold, is a very serious question, so long as "unions" or employment under the government is required or payment for party work.

The government need not go into "closer relations" with the agricultural interests than it has with the manufacturing interests, and nevertheless carry out the proposition under consideration. There is no necessity for the government increasing its force threefold or tenfold by carrying out this proposition. All that is required is for Congress to adopt a prohibitive shipping receipt or waybill, and to establish an auditing office for checking, paying, and cancelling these waybills. Several hundred clerks will be sufficient for that purpose.

Opinion of Mr. E. W. JONES, editor Richmond *Guardian*, Quebec:

Your views on true protection to native interests and labor are sound. By the way, I do not see why, if your plan is practicable—and I think it is—the "postal" system should be limited to farm products; the Post Office now transmits all sorts of articles within a certain weight and bulk.

All sorts of articles can go by mail now. I send hundreds of parcels that way every day. The rate is 16 cents per pound, which, while not too high to send bonnets, laces or neckties that way, is an absolutely prohibitory rate for farm products.

Classification One, of my proposition, pages 3-6, calls for "specified farm products in limited weight and bulk be mailable and forwarded through the mails at a uniform rate of one cent per pound."

Cheap valueless novels are carried that way now, and at the rate I name, and in any quantity, and no one but the publisher and retailer is benefited. Whereas, the carriage of farm products at the rate I name would benefit the million.

Opinion of THE EINSTEIN COMPANY, clothing manufacturers, Chicago, Ill.:

In order to carry out your ideas, the United States government would have to own the railroads, which, to our free institutions, would be a continual menace of perpetuating the party in power.

You are certainly mistaken in your assertion, and are evidently under the impression that in adopting the proposition advocated the government employees would be obliged to handle the farm products of the country, whereas, nothing of the kind is advocated. A shipping receipt or way-bill, issued by authority of Congress, is to be used by the shipper for the products included in the law, and in the same manner as now. The only additional work involved is the presentation of this way-bill to a government auditing office at Washington, by the transportation company, for the additional amount; the additional amount to be taken from the amount collected through the protective tariff.

Opinion of PROFESSOR E. W. HILGARD, California State University, Berkeley:

My opinion on this proposition is that, unless the uniform rate were made applicable to all transportation—manufactured goods as well as farm products—it would be just as impossible to introduce it as George's single tax, from the same cause.

I fail to see any connection in the illustration given.

Does the Professor deny that manufactures are protected? Does he deny that all interests are protected, except staple farm products? Does he deny the fact that the prices for staple farm products are fixed at Liverpool? Is that not a free-trade price? Does not that price rule for the quantity exported, and for the quantity sold at home? If he does not deny these, then he must admit that staple farm products are compelled to foot the costs for every penny of protection.

That is, no matter whose interest it protects,

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

the producer of staples is obliged to pay for it in full. Not to deny that, and to give it as his opinion that manufactures shall share equally with farm products in the reduction in rates on the adoption of this proposition, seems, to say the least, strange.

The freight revenue in the United States for 1893, as given by the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, was \$799,316,042, and if a sum were set aside from the tariff receipts to reduce rates on transportation for manufactures as well as farm products, the amount would be too trifling to be felt, or to do any good. But the same amount applied on farm products alone, would make a perceptible difference in the net return to the farmer; especially so, as a reduction in freight advances the price of products, not alone for the amount exported, but for the greater bulk sold at home.

Furthermore, a reduction in the carriage of manufactures has not generally the effect of increasing wages or stimulating trade, for at no time in the history of California has the rate on manufactures been as low as it has been recently, and is now (having been reduced from \$1.50 to \$1.80 per hundred on clothing, dry goods, etc.), and yet at no time in the history of California were wages so low, work so scarce, profits so meagre, and commerce so unsteady. Why? Because the prime customer of labor, the farmer, has received too low a margin of profit on his product, as a rule, and in many instances no margin at all, therefore closing the primary avenue for commercial transactions. And as a result the entire commercial system has lost vitality.

Freight charges on manufactures absolutely free would not remedy matters. The only remedy is to be had in having the primary industry return a profit to the producer. Is it not stupid shortsightedness, therefore, to compel the producer of staple farm products to pay out of his meagre returns for the protecting of all the other industries and individuals in the United States? Is it just? Is it honest? Is it politic?

Further on Professor Hilgard says:

I think, too, that the principle of paying for a service what it actually costs is intrinsically right and just.

I agree with you perfectly, and by this rule alone, if by no other, the producer of staples should not be made to pay for protection as long as his product at home and abroad is sold at free-trade prices.

Continuing, Professor Hilgard says:

The justification of the single uniform rate of postage is the educational nature of the service. It does not favor one class above another. That is a radical vice of the proposition, and is why it cannot be introduced and carried out successfully.

Upon investigation Professor Hilgard will find that the postal service, as in operation, does favor one class above another; that it not alone serves as an educational factor, but it also serves any number of dry-goods houses in doing a "mail-order" business, and that it serves a large number of publishers to send thousands of tons of trashy novels through the mail at a uniform rate of one cent a pound. (For a list of a few, please see page 6.)

Here we have storekeepers and publishers favored at the expense of everyone else; no one seems to object, and that in spite of the fact that this very class of mail causes the department an annual deficit of millions of dollars.

In speaking of education, however, it is presumed that Professor Hilgard as a liberal economist will assent to the proposition that the rate of wages is a prime factor in general education. To illustrate: A wage of one piaster, twenty kreutzers, fifty pence, three kopeks, a franc, or even two shillings a day, is not near as good a factor in general education as a wage rate of \$2 per day. If this is true—and who can doubt it?—then the very base, the foundation, making general education possible, is the wage rate.

The people of Egypt, India and Russia have as much postal facilities as we have, and yet they do not seem to profit by "the educational nature of the service" nearly as much as we. What would be their wages \$2 a day?

In conclusion Professor Hilgard says:

I think that practically it would involve government ownership of railroads, which is all very good, but in our republican government with its party and spoils system, will it be mercifully postponed until a decent civil order is established.

There is no greater necessity for government ownership of railroads in order to carry out the provisions of the three classifications of the proposition advocated than there is for government ownership of cigars and tobacco in order to manage the excise and internal revenue. In fact, much less so, for the necessary machinery involved to carry out Classification Two and Three (see pages 3 and 7) is in the government auditing office at Washington several hundred clerks, the same as every railroad company has. The expense for this is trifling, and even this expense can be saved by reorganizing the Government Agricultural Department, and having that department do the work in the place of the far less profitable work which that department now does which costs the Government millions of dollars every year.

Mr. Brooks is an inventor and newspaper writer.

235 FIFTH AVENUE,
BROOKLYN, N. Y., December 16, 1893
To Mr. DAVID LUBIN—Dear Sir:

I am favorably impressed with your proposition. It is a step so far ahead of the popular prejudice against ordinary methods that you must not be discouraged if it takes a long time to pass through the law-making powers, but that has been true with all great reforms, and is no serious objection to the prosecution of it. The most ignorant and wasteful evil we have to contend with is the influence of the people, led by demagogues to fair trial to new laws that can only be justified by fair trial as shown on the tariff question. Our country is producing men of mighty power and good, but no sooner do they propose a reform than it is assailed by the little men who do not comprehend it. Yours truly,

JOHN S. BAE

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

on of Mr. F. W. CORSE, of Stewart & dry goods commission merchants, 78 n street, New York:

read carefully your proposition, and though impression was that the plan seemed hardly upon further consideration I have changed ion and think that your plan, though meet much opposition, especially from farmers to large cities, would in a few years meet approval of the majority. I am a protect-and as the farmers are the only class whom directly or indirectly, do not derive benefit roective tariff, it is no more than fair that sideration should be given to their welfare. y there would be a wail from our fruit grow-east, but I wish for the welfare of the mad conditions would even up I think.

ion as the farmers in the east begin to that the development of the west, est, and south means the development own market; that more manufactures demanded, that more workmen will be ed, that wages will be firmer, and that ll greatly increase the demand for their ts; as soon as this will be understood, tern farmer will favor the proposition tily as the western and southern farmer

orse concludes as follows:

a say, agriculture is the mainspring of the and it is natural to suppose that the more enghened, the better will be the condition ther industries.

ion of PROFESSOR PAASCHE (member Reichstag), Berlin, Germany (trans-

translation of the little pamphlet of Lubin uly to hand, and examined same at once. d of great interest was to me the grave int of the American farmer. While on a America, I was impressed with the fact our farmers are not at all satisfied with ndition, and I believe have good cause for ints; but never heard nor believed that nplaints were of such a serious and wide nature. In Mr. Lubin's proposition, I conat its novelty is deserving of some atten-it as far as practicability of the plan is ed, I am of the opinion that it can never led out.

rofessor Paasche will only stop to conpe will not only admit that the proposi-not only practicable, but is in operation egree) in Europe. We have the infor- of Dr. D. Lexis, of Gottingen, Ger-that farm products are carried by mail, hou the German empire, up to ten s, for 50 pfenigs, or 5 pfenigs per pound ent per pound). This covers classifica-ne of the proposition advocated. Dr. has also informed us (see page 33), that in bulk has a lesser pro rata rate for a distance than for the lesser distance. rinciple covers "classification two" of oposition. He has also informed us that ry, in its zone system, carries wheat ther agricultural products for export at ally low rates. In this we have the prin-f "classification three" of this proposition. ay, therefore, conclude that the proposi-dvated, being in successful operation tain countries of Europe, is no longer

new, deserving only to be called a new ques-tion here, and when advocated for adoption in the United States.

The degree of expenditure by the govern-ment in the adoption of each classification is, however, a question to be determined, and, if adopted, will no doubt vary with the changes in the administration, until the time shall have arrived when protection to manufacture and protection to agriculture shall be about as equitably sustained as conditions will permit. Agricultural protection may start in by the adoption of "classification one" (see pages 3-6). Classifications two and three may be given a trial on a moderate appropriation, and increased as rapidly as experience and the tariff approp-riation will permit. The most advantageous results would of course be had in a uniform rate. But if this cannot be had at the start it would be wise to start with what is wise and practicable, and by degrees to work to the point of a maximum benefit for the whole country.

Continuing, Professor Paasche says:

Our agricultural interests also suffer through the pressure of the world's price, but low freights alone cannot counteract this. In the United States much more could be accomplished, by breaking the monopoly of the big railways, and abolishing the unreasonably high tariff.

At the present time there is no more practicable method for the control within bounds of the great railway monopolies, than by the adoption of the proposition herein advocated. For, by its adoption, every voter in the country becomes indirectly a shipper, and we may then expect legislation that will protect the interests of the people.

As for abolishing the tariff, that is not to our liking. We do not wish to abolish it, because we prefer to give employment to the millions of workpeople in our own country. Nor do we wish these millions to have their wage rate lowered to the standard in Europe. If free trade is so desirable, why does not Germany introduce it? Probably for the same reason that we do not.

Opinion of Mr. ANDREW JUGENS, President of the Andrews Soap Company, Cincinnati, Ohio:

There are in it essential points that are worthy of consideration. I agree with you that our far-away States should have some protection.

HON. W. W. HILL, Assistant Superntend-ent Free Delivery System of the United States Post Office Department, in a communication from Washington of November 13th gives it as his opinion that the proposition advocated is entirely feasible.

Opinion of Mr. L. M. SIMSON, of Simson, Greenebaum & Rosenthal, cloak manufactur-ers, 1199 Park Avenue, New York:

The idea is beyond a doubt very practical, but I am afraid that it will take a long time to interest enough people to introduce the new measure. Please send

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

me five more copies to distribute among some friends, who, I am sure, will take interest in the matter and assist the new enterprise.

You are right, it may take a long time, but this need not deter us from going ahead, as long as we believe the proposition to be based on justice and equity, and in the interest of our country. There is a possibility, however, that it may not take so long a time as we now think it will, for observe: You read the pamphlet; are impressed with its practicability; as a result have asked for five more copies for your friends; others have done the same; and so the idea spreads as rapidly as circumstances permit.

Opinion of PROFESSOR EDWIN R. SELIGMAN, Professor of Political Economy, Columbia College of Political Science, New York:

There is no reason why one class should be favored at the public expense.

No, there is not. But you will admit, Professor, that this is practically what the tariff does.

Further on Professor Seligman says:

It seems to me that Mr. Lubin is attempting to overcome economic laws. Why should California have a natural market for fruit in New York, and it in New York why not in London and Calcutta.

No, I am not trying to "overcome" but to further the practical application of economic laws to the end that the general good may be served.

The reason why California should have a natural market in New York and not in London or Calcutta is because California helps support New York. Because if California even desired to help support London or Calcutta she could not do so on account of the tariff.

As a matter of political economy, you will admit that every profitable orchard and vineyard in California helps not alone to sustain the industrial interests of New York, but in addition is a material factor in the increase of New York real estate values. There is not a shaft, wheel, belt, bench or tool in a New York workshop whose value is not influenced by California's progress. Nor is there a workman, a manufacturer, a merchant or a professional man who is not influenced thereby.

Take the theory of the tariff, for instance; who will deny that it does not tend in the direction of a higher wage rate? Yet that higher wage is practically at the expense of the grower of staple farm products.

The adoption of the proposition herein advocated would likewise tend in the appreciation of the wage rate, but not at the ultimate expense of anyone, for the tax would be compensated in the reduced cost of the greater volume of the product.

It would simply permit a much greater expansion in the development of the resources for which each section is best fitted, and permit the expansion to a maximum, and maintain it there, resulting first of all in a steady demand for labor and all concurrent advantages.

The reduction in the price to the producer

by reason of the greater production would not take away the increased return which it is hoped to gain by the adoption of this proposition. Why? Because first of all the reduced carriage rate will help out to meet it not alone in the East, but in the home market as well.

To illustrate: When fruit is worth $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents in New York, and it costs $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents to "lay it down" in that city, it will only bring one cent net in California. Should the railroad rate be reduced to $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, the price in California would be 2 cents net. The greater increase in production might reduce the selling price, however, but there would be an ample base to stand it. Should the price still fall, reduce the rate again until it is so low that the surplus may be exported.

Should Europe also adopt this proposition, it can do no harm, for the law of cost on transportation is, the lower the rate the higher the price of the product. Yes, New York should be our "natural market," because California buys its manufactured goods there, and conditions that will tend in a fair return for our products must result in benefit to New York, to its wage rate, its commerce and real estate values. Professor Seligman further says:

There is such a thing as natural advantages of situation, and no inventions can absolutely eliminate this factor.

Does the "natural advantage of situation" give wage-earners in the United States \$2 when the European workman only receives a mark a day?

Does not the tariff have something to do with it? And yet the tariff and the "natural advantage of situation" are two distinct things. And what the tariff is to manufacturers that the reduction in freight rates will be for agriculture.

Opinion of MR. JOHN FOSTER, of John Foster & Co., shoe manufacturers, Beloit, Wisconsin:

It involves so many interests it might be impossible to get any harmony of action. However, it is worth thinking about and bringing out opinions on the subject, and I wish you success. Your reasoning is plain and convincing, and it may be one of the lights of a new opening of our national progress.

Opinion of MR. CHAS. N. PAGE, editor of *The Western Garden*, Des Moines, Iowa:

By your system of postage you would, we believe, release the Government from claims for loss or damage in transit, which the railroad companies have. You are doubtless aware that the Government is not responsible for mail (even registered letters) lost in transit.

If Editor Page will kindly read the proposition on page 3, he will see that he is correct insofar as Classification One is concerned.

Specifications One and Two are not in the least affected by his criticism, for the shipping is to be done precisely as it is done now. The transportation companies are to be released from no responsibility, the only difference being that the shipper will use a government shipping receipt, on which receipt the transportation company is to collect from a government auditing office the additional amount due according to law.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

on of Hon. P. O'SULLIVAN, Mayor of
, Kentucky:

your novel proposition as far as it goes,
k it would be better to let the government
e all the railroads in the country, and
them; it would be the means of doing
th a large, and getting to be dangerous,
ly.

ive the government purchase the rail-
easily said. Is it desirable to tack on to
ministration 800,000 employees? Even
were not in the way, how could the
nent obtain the ten billion dollars to
e it with? Confiscation is unlawful;
were confiscation even attempted (and
will be), the shares owned by citizens
gn countries would bring protests of a
hat could not be disregarded. Would
e better to permit the owners to own
ls, and for the people to legislate just
ese roads should do? Among the vot-
many are shippers? Scarce one in a
id, but by the adoption of this proposi-
ery voter would be practically, though
ly, a shipper.

on of PROFESSOR W. J. ASHLEY, M. A.,
ard University, Cambridge, Mass.:

urs to me that Mr. Lubin's proposal as to
cation one"—small packet transportation
y maintainable, if some sort of standard
can be fixed so as to diminish the labor
ing. Here many of the principles which
Sir Rowland Hill to advocate a uniform
are applicable; and Mr. Lubin may gain
ing from a study of postal history as it is
for instance in Birbeck Hill's "Life of
land Hill," London, De La Rue, 1880.
ght may also be gained by a study of the
1 experiments of uniform charge within
"zones." I think Mr. Lubin would do
o to dissociate his proposition from such
as protection and free trade, which
lly nothing to do with it.

ssor Ashley is correct insofar as "class-
one" of this proposition is concerned.
fication three," however, can only be
ined as tenable just so long as there is a
ve tariff. With the adoption of free
here would no longer be any more jus-
maintaining it than there is in the con-
on of the protective tariff without it.

of the new conditions already set forth
re herein, it is advocated as a measure
ne of equity and a reciprocity of bene-
; as an absolute necessity.

on of the REV. JOSEPH LEONARD LEVY,
lphia, Penn.:

rection at stake is of prime importance.
s the wealth of the whole nation. This
tion is based upon no party cry. It aims
the interest of none, while it is intended
it the many. It is evidently framed for
ection of the true producers of all wealth,
efore for the protection of capital, too.
ing that improves the condition and
ng of the farmer improves also the whole
it would appear that the clergy should
s matter in hand and frankly and freely
t with their various congregations.
clergy can be, if they will, the molders of

public opinion, just as they permit themselves to
become its echo. Their influence for good is un-
disputed, their power unquestioned. They have
this exceptionally great advantage; they are able
to speak to men in places and at times when they
are most willing to listen, and most anxious to
gain information.

In a communication of November 8th, Mr.
SAMUEL N. GRIFFITH, of Rice Lake, Wis., in
criticising this proposition says:

California and all the rest of the United States would
fill up with towns and cities of the original American
type. Producers and consumers would be brought
together. You have struck one of the branches of an
idea that is as wide as the world, and as vast as all
future human history. Its proper application will
not only emancipate the industrial system of our own
nation, but also elevate humanity the world over.

Opinion of THE B. F. GOODRICH Co., Akron
Rubber Works, dated at Akron, O., November
1, 1893:

We believe that any scheme that would result in
material and permanent benefit to agriculture, would
be an incalculable advantage to the whole country.
We are strongly impressed with the boldness, origi-
nality, and apparent plausibility of your proposition.
* * * No objections occur to us that you have not
fully met. Whether this conclusion would be sus-
tained by a more deliberate investigation we cannot
say. At any rate we desire to express our admiration
of the very lucid and forcible way in which you treat
your subject, and of the ease with which you seem
to disarm your critics.

Opinion of N. J. SCHLOSS & Co., manufac-
turers of boys' clothing, New York:

We have read your pamphlet with a great deal of
interest, and heartily approve of the proposition
which you advance. We consider your work a valu-
able one as aiding in the solution of a question which
will receive attention in the near future.

PROFESSOR LEWIS M. AYER, of the Patrick
Military Institute, Anderson, S. C., in criticiz-
ing this proposition, says:

But that unjust state of things could never have
taken place if the Constitution had been respected
in the legislation of Congress. That solemn com-
pact between the States of the Union had to be
grossly violated before a protective tariff act could
be enacted. The Government of the United States
is a government of strictly limited powers, and
its delegated and carefully limited powers are all
explicitly laid down in the Federal Constitution.
That instrument expressly gives Congress the
power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof,
and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of
weights and measures." The Constitution also
gives Congress the power to establish postoffices
and post roads."

The Professor is correct as far as he has quoted,
but he did not quote enough in order to justify
him in making the statement "that the solemn
compact between the States of the Union had
to be grossly violated before a protective tariff
act could be enacted?"

In the preamble we read that one of the ob-
jects of the Constitution is to "promote the
general welfare."

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

Article I, Section 7: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

Section 8: "The Congress shall have power * * * to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Influenced by sectional feeling, intensified by real or imaginary sectional injury, some minds are inclined to work themselves up to a pitch and give vent to their emotional ebullitions in the line of least resistance. The line of least resistance, as it appears to Professor Ayer, is in the direction above indicated.

Were the "solemn compact grossly violated" in the establishment of the protective tariff, many more people in the United States would have been as well informed about it as the Professor.

Does the Professor really mean to imply that every Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States and the people of the United States have been gross violators of the Constitution ever since the protective tariff was established? He is certainly mistaken.

And if he is mistaken, then protection as a measure "to promote the general welfare" is politic. Politic it certainly is, but the question remains, is it just?

Under present conditions, no, because the burden rests entirely upon the producers of staple farm products, and the benefits go to the balance of the people.

The proposition which I advocate, and which the Professor so vehemently denounces in his communication, is intended to make just what is now unjust, by giving to the producer of staples his share of the benefits of protection in the form of rebates on freight charges.

As a South Carolinian, Professor Ayer probably thinks he is voicing the sentiments of the South when he denounces protection. The South as it was—Yes, but the "New South"—No. The rapid increase of manufacture in the South in recent years has changed the opinion of the people there on the question of protection in a marked degree, as the following dispatch from New York, December 27th, to the *Sacramento Record-Union* will show:

The "Commercial Advertiser's" Washington special says: The trouble the Democrats are having in their own ranks over the tariff question comes almost entirely from the Southern people. In the reports made to have the Wilson bill changed or defeated in the Senate, it has been developed that the protection sentiment has been growing in the South with extraordinary rapidity.

Professor Ayer need not even go as far as to inquire of the Southern manufacturers whether they want protection. He need only interview the peanut-growers of his State if they are anxious to have peanuts on the free list, and he will be told promptly and without reserve how the peanut-growers stand on protection.

It may be that Professor Ayer is a little behind the times, and does not know it. Can he or the "Old South" ever hope to have more favorable legislation in the interest of free trade than under the present administration? Certainly not, and yet, let him but glance over

that dreaded document by Northern protectionists, the Wilson bill, and he will find—what? That it is bristling with protection. And we may safely predict that considerable additions will be made in the increase of protection before its passage, and the increase will be urged by Southern Democrats as vehemently as by Northern Republicans.

Let us hope that the time is not far distant when Professor Ayer will find it right to advocate protection, and when he does, as a just man, that he will at the same time urge the adoption of the proposition herein advocated.

Opinion of ANDREW FURSETH, Secretary of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, San Francisco, Cal.:

I think the law of distance and its influence on wages (hence on the standard of civilization) is sound, and in order to overcome this law some such arrangement as proposed by you must be adopted. As further reasons, allow me to suggest that the invention and development of machinery must ultimately drive the people back from the cities to the soil. This seems to me as a foregone conclusion—man must go where his labor can support him. The present system of transportation and cultivation by railways and in bonanza farms set men idle during the greater part of the year, while it impoverishes the soil, and is therefore a failure. It seems to me that your proposition tends to smaller farms.

Opinion of MR. S. OPENHEIMER, cloak manufacturer, 471 Broadway, New York:

My opinion on this proposition is, that it would make it incumbent upon the U. S. Government to own and operate the railroads and transportation facilities of the country, and constitute its administration into a sort of paternal directorium; this, in turn, would deprive the people of their sense of individuality and independence, cause loss of self-reliance and energy, which were the main springs of our marvelous development; and it is easy to conjecture that such a system would generate sectional difficulties and discrimination.

It is impossible to understand how it is possible for this government to become a "paternal directorium" by simply paying out on transportation a portion of the funds it collects on the protective tariff, especially as the machinery for putting this into operation will only require a government auditing room of several hundred clerks.

There is no more necessity for the government to own the railroads before this can be done, than it is for you, as a cloak manufacturer, to own the mills making the cloth that you manufacture into cloaks.

Opinion of the PROVIDENCE SHADE ROLLER COMPANY, of Bristol, R. I.:

That it would be of great benefit to the West, and although we believe that the New England farmer would suffer, it would be a vast saving to the masses.

If the prosperity of the West is to result in the people of the West selling their products to New England, and then buying their manufactures in Europe, you would be correct. But as long as Southern or Western prosperity tends to the greater consumption of New England manufacture, then you are not correct. More

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

and for New England manufacture means better employment of New England workmen. The greater employment of workingmen will improve the condition of the New England farmer.

N. JOHN WANAMAKER, Philadelphia, in a communication dated October 26, 1893, says:

I pleased to have your letter of the 17th with 7 of your pamphlet, which is full of suggestions. The question of transporting farm products by mail particularly interests me; but I think it would be practicable unless the Mail Service was reorganized, and even if not impracticable to adjust the rate to carry mail and farm products.

to carry out the proposition advocated it is necessary to have farm products in bulk shipped by the Post Office Department at all. A table shipping receipt or way bill issued by Congress, as set forth on page — in this pamphlet, would cover the ground. There is, however, no difficulty in forwarding small packages of farm products in limited quantities and bulk through the United States Office Department. That can be done to satisfy any farmer, provided he is willing to pay 6 cents per pound postage.

Now, while this rate is low enough on bonnetties, drugs or fancy goods, it is prohibitory on farm products.

The rate on farm products in limited bulk weight reduced to one cent a pound (which is the present rate on trashy novels), will largely tend to increase the number of farms in every section of the Union. Thereon, Mr. Wanamaker says:

It seems impossible to get any congressional action favoring the people with increased mail facilities, because of the opposition of the great monopolies of express and telegraph companies.

Forable congressional action in the interest of the people can be had, provided they elect the proper representatives. If they fail to do this, they have no one to blame themselves.

For protection, Mr. Wanamaker says:

I think the protection of manufactures not detrimental to the farmer for the reason that if there is not to be any protection, the manufacturing must be done abroad, and there would be less work in this country and a smaller market for the products of the farm.

There would certainly be much less work for workingmen by the free trade system, or even lowering the present tariff rates.

For employment of more working people, however, does not and cannot increase the price of staple farm products as long as the market price for these products are fixed at a pool. And, in reality, the case stands as follows: the greater the development of manufacture the higher the wage rate, but the greater the development of staple farm production the lower the return to the farmer. Because of this is in the fact that while the working man, through protection, receives the highest wage rate in the world, the farmer of this country actually pays the working man this rate of wages out of his own pocket. I am inclined to doubt this statement, please advise wherein it is wrong.

The manufacturer pays for protection, but

he pays himself back with greatly increased profits. The working man pays for protection, and he receives it back with profit in high wages.

The professional man pays for protection, and he receives it back with profit on high salary and fees.

The producer of staples pays for protection, but as he sells his product at Liverpool prices at home and abroad, he receives nothing in return. And as he is the only one paying and receiving nothing in return, he is the only one actually paying for protection.

Are the working men of this country aware of the fact that the producers of staples and not the manufacturers are paying them out of their pockets about half of their wages? Is this a joke? No, indeed, there is not a political economist in the United States or in Europe that can refute it.

Is this right? Is it equitable? Is it just? No, nor is it politic, for the producer of staples is the primary customer of manufactures; when the producer is crippled, the chief customer of labor is crippled. It is therefore right, equitable, just and politic that the farmer receive back at least a portion of the amount which he is compelled to pay out for protection. The most practicable manner in which this can be done is by the adoption of the proposition advocated herein, by having the government pay out a portion of the protection money in lowering freight charges.

In conclusion, Mr. Wanamaker says:

I agree with you that anything that would bring the unemployed out of the great cities would be an advantage all round.

Nothing will so tend to bring the unemployed out of the great cities as the encouragement of fair wages, steady work and profitable returns on farms.

All of which the proposition herein advocated is intended to bring about.

Opinion of Dr. D. LEXIS, Professor of Political Economy, Gottingen, Germany (translated):

The principle of your plan is at present used to a small degree here by sending 10-pound parcels throughout the empire at the uniform rate of 10 cents, or at 1 cent per pound.

Were the privilege in operation in the United States, it would cover "specification one" of the proposition, and this would permit farmers to do a "mail order" business, which would open out an avenue for a profitable business to a very large number of people now on farms and to many now congested in the large cities.

It would tend in a great degree to promote farming on five or ten acres of land, and tend largely to the subdivision of larger holdings.

As the privilege is withheld from all except publishers to send books at one cent a pound, the privilege may be extended to include domestic farm products at the same rate.

The granting of this privilege would not alone benefit the farmers of our country, but would be of equal benefit to the consumers, and in addition would largely tend to the development of that skill and technical knowl-

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

edge in preparation and proper form for marketing so essential to profitable marketing.

This system of farming, when permitted, will employ profitably every available member of a family. The father in the field, the mother in preparation and the children in packing, labeling and directing the packages. And as the "mail order" business is done for cash in advance, it is the safest possible. Dr. Lexis further says:

Freight in larger quantities are not sent at uniform rates for all distances, but on the contrary are classified according to distances, but the greater the distance the smaller is the rate per mile.

In principle this would seem to cover classification two of my proposition. The only objection being that it is in operation in Germany, but not in the United States. And if it is of an advantage in Germany, how much more necessary is it for a country as vast in territory as ours is. The Professor further says:

In the "zonen tariff" of the Hungarian railways, the rates on wheat and other agricultural produce for export are established in favor of the farmer.

This principle would seem to cover classification number three of this proposition.

Those, therefore, who oppose my proposition because it may seem to them new and without precedent can offer no such objection any more, for Dr. Lexis has shown that all three classifications of this proposition are in operation in Europe. The only thing that remains to be done is to introduce it in the United States.

And the quicker this is done the better. Should the present administration refuse to do so, there is a remedy at hand in the next campaign.

Opinion of Mr. G. W. PERKINS, President Cigarmakers' International Union of America, Chicago, Illinois:

Permit me to state that I am now and always have been in favor of any means whereby the products of the agricultural districts can be conveyed at the lowest possible cost to the workers in the industrial centers.

Opinion of C. A. HOLBROOK, Esq., of Edward Miller & Co., manufacturer of brass goods, New York:

The best government is the one in which every man is absolutely free to do that which is right to himself and not wrong to his neighbor.

This is good doctrine. You are correct.

A government should hold the scales of justice evenly balanced as between all governed by it.

This also is good and sound, but can you please tell me how the scales of justice are held at the present time? Suppose one end of the scale was held over Edward Miller & Co.'s factory at Meriden, Conn., and the other end over a cotton plantation or a wheat field, what then? Would the scales be evenly balanced? No, indeed! The heavy end would be found over the factory at Meriden, and the light end high above reach would be over the cotton plantation and wheat field.

Your industry is protected, but who the bill? When your industry pays for protection, does it not reimburse itself somehow for it? When the producer of farm products pays for protection is he reimbursed by the British government when compelled to sell his product at Liverpool prices? Who reimburses him?

No one! and as he is the only one who and receives nothing in return, he pays it. Your industry, therefore, helps itself in the pockets of the producer of farm products and then generously state that "a government should hold the scales of justice evenly balanced as between all governed by it."

But wait, we are not done yet. Quite a few years ago I was in the employ of your firm and traveled and sold its goods on the road. There were times when I was told that the burners and brass kettles must not be sold at "less than combination" prices. What "combination" prices mean? It means what it says. The manufacturers combine and when the producer bought a lamp he paid for burner, protection and combination.

A moment more; the working men in employ probably belonged to a labor union and what is the labor union for? Is it for "short hours and big pay?" Certainly.

Now, then, the producer in buying a burner paid for burner, protection, combination and union. And when the lamp or manufacturer bought cotton or wheat from the producer, he paid only the price fixed in Liverpool.

While this was rank injustice right along there was no help for it. Simply because the scales of justice inclined where the weights were heaviest. But now a condition comes that will compel the blind goddess to look to her business in a more equitable manner.

Just as long as the farmer could be helped and in spite of it exist, there was no objection to render him justice. The time, however, come when this can no longer be done with impunity. When Araby Pasha was driven out of Egypt by England the Egyptian government took possession. Then began the introduction of the most approved agricultural implements and devices into that country. These were placed in the hands of the Egyptian laborer. Though clumsy at the start in time mastered the use of these appliances. With every year added he became more and more expert, until to-day the Egyptian laborer receiving five cents a day can most perform as much labor as an American hand receiving a dollar a day and more.

What has been done in Egypt, has likewise been done and is being done in India, on a much larger scale. And Professor Leitch (late of Russia,) Professor of Political Economy at the Chicago University, told me a few weeks ago that the great plantations of Southern Russia were discarding all primitive agricultural devices, and were replacing them with the most modern and appliances makes to be had.

All of this has had the effect of lowering the price of staple farm products to a rate at which it is impossible for the American producer to exist on.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

this condition likely to change, for the Egyptian, Indian and Russian can earn a fair profit at the low rate, and so at even much lower rates—the farmer of our country can no longer maintain prices on the prices realized, and this is the reason why there are now 3,000,000 unemployed. Why orders for goods are curtailed. Why factories are shut down. It is at all surprising, for the farmer and the hand is the primary and principal producers of manufactured goods, and when money is moneyless and the farm hand is first one after them to feel the effect is like a man in shop or factory.

Further on Mr. Holbrook says; "Protection or favoritism to any one or more members of the governed will ultimately result in more or less unpleasant conditions, and so is wrong."

to understand that you favor free trade. If your industry and the industries of New England manufacturers favor free trade to compete with the Austrian and German burner makers and still pay the same rate of wages to those you employ, then the problem is solved.

As all then say amen to free trade. In respect, however, that when manufacturers say "class," they mean the farmer, but when the farmer is mentioned they do not say "class." The truth, however, is that the farmer will fit the manufacturer just as it will the farmer—not a whit less.

may we of the West or the South that you eastern manufacturers are sincere in the statement made above? Is not a general report that the New England manufacturers have curtailed work in their shops and reduced wages because of your fears of changes in the tariff? Is much mischief being done through a change, what greater mischief may be brought about by free trade itself? Can we be had without loss to labor let us see trade. If that cannot be had, then we have protection, but not for your interest. Let it be just; let agriculture, too, be protected. And it is for this very reason we advocate the proposition herein out. The government rebate on freight paid on the protective tariff fund will give back the farmer in part or whole the amount he has for protection.

Letter of SELZ, SCHWAB & Co., manufacturers of boots and shoes, Chicago, Ill., dated October 17, 1893:

"We read over with considerable interest the letter you sent us, and in response to your letter that we think the 'proposition' a good one for the farmer, if it can be brought about."

Letter of PROFESSOR JAMES RODWAY, F. L. S., of *The Times* (journal of the Royal Agricultural and Commercial Society of Britain), dated Georgetown, British Guiana, December 12, 1893:

"It can be no doubt that such an arrangement

so proposed would be of very great benefit to the farmers who are at present debarred from carrying on their business at a profit on account of the high railroad freights."

In giving his opinion on "classification one" of this proposition, relating to the forwarding of specified farm products in limited weight and bulk to be carried by the Post Office at a uniform rate of one cent per pound. Professor Rodway says:

"Here in British Guiana we once paid 24 cents for a half-ounce letter; now it has been reduced to five (British Guiana denomination), but this did not come all at once. And in the same way an enormous development might take place in the parcel post with corresponding reductions."

Further on Professor Rodway says:

"Why cannot the Americans see what a heavy burden is their protective system? As a naturalist, believing in the survival of the fittest, it appears to me quite unnatural. If you wish your child to grow up strong and be able to stand alone, you let him get out of his leading strings as soon as possible—not give him crutches when he can walk. This is what it appears to me some governments are doing: Nature's barriers are first being removed by improvements in locomotion, and instead of taking advantage of this artificial fences are erected."

"We cannot do away with the protective system because the majority want it, and because free trade would upset things generally, and would reduce the wage rate not only to the English level, but to the Austrian and Italian level. To keep order under such circumstances would require soldiers, and above all a king. What is the good of a king if we can get along comfortably without one?"

"If we wish a child to grow up strong" we refrain him from his natural inclinations in lying, stealing or from other vicious habits, and as a result we have a moral man."

"Were we to permit unrestricted free trade, our civilization would take a retrogressive turn. The rate of wages is the most potent factor in the development of a nation. Let \$2 be the normal wage rate in India for a day's work for twenty years, and England would not have ships enough, men enough, money enough, to hold her under subjection."

"Let the nihilists assassinate the Czar in Russia, and on the self-same day there will be another Czar, and perhaps prove even a greater oppressor and despot than the one killed. Let the general wage rate be \$2 a day there for even ten years, and the Czar would disappear for good."

"The trouble is not with protection, it is with a one-sided protection."

"The chief customer of our country, the producer of staples, has been selected to bear all the burden for the cost of protection, but in return we allow him nothing."

"This, of course, is unjust, and it is this injustice which must be overcome in order to maintain the measure of prosperity our country is entitled to. In conclusion, Professor Rodway says:

"Your project is one that will tend to overcome some of nature's difficulties, but as long as an obstructive policy is kept up it will only be a partial success."

"No, Professor, it will be a complete success, because it will tend to equalize the burdens and benefits."

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

Opinion of BARBER & COMPANY, shoe manufacturers, Auburn, N. Y.:

That it is a decidedly novel and advanced idea, but it seems to us practical. To advance the condition of the agriculturist is necessary. We can think of no better way of returning to him that tax which he pays for manufacturers' (protection) than that suggested by you. We thank you for opportunity of reading proposition, and will now pass book to our friends.

Opinion of the VERY REVEREND T. C. MIDDLETON, D. D. O. S. A., Augustinian College of St. Thomas, of Villanova, Delaware county, Pennsylvania:

Objections to your scheme do not imply opposition to it. As regards your proposition I have taken no side. I cannot oppose a plan that has for its object the bettering of the avowed misery of millions of my fellow men. This alone would commend your proposition to every sympathetic soul. But I am yet in doubt whether your plan will succeed in effecting this without throwing additional burdens on others.

In answer to the above, I wish to state that this is not intended to throw additional burdens on others, but as a means of equalizing them more evenly.

Continuing, Dr. Middleton says:

Both protection and free trade are down in my vocabulary as necessary principles to be followed in all the varied lines of human thought and human action. For instance: I protect the fruits of my own industry, of my brains and work. I am entitled to protect them; they are my own and nobody else's. I maintain that I can, humanly speaking, do with them whatever I choose. It is no man's business to say me nay, should I prefer to hoard up my fruits, or sell them at whatever price I choose, or even destroy them. Each man is the master, under God, of his own work. This is natural protection—a natural right inherent in every man to do with his own what he pleases.

The above is self-evident common sense, and under the ordinary rule in operation among civilized people, is generally followed. There is an exception, however, to which I wish particularly to call the attention of Dr. Middleton. And that exception is in the case of the producer of staple farm products. Suppose Dr. Middleton were a western rancher or a southern planter, that he raised wheat or cotton, and the government was to step in and by a process of law, deprive him of half his income on the ground that the half income taken from him would enable others to do better than they could otherwise do, what would he say to that? Would not then the "natural right inherent in every man to do with his own as he pleases" be violated? Certainly. And yet this is precisely the very thing that is being done to the producers of staple farm products by the protective tariff. Every pound of this product is sold, at home or for export, on the free trade Liverpool quotations, and in competition with the cheapest labor in the world. When, however, this same producer desires to buy his necessities in the cheapest market, the law prevents him doing so, but he must buy in the dearest market, in order that some others may be benefitted. Measured by your statements, this arrangement cannot be called just. It is not just. It is, however, profitable to the other party. And just as long as it was profit

able "the other party" did not trouble about the unjustness of the case.

A new condition has, however, arisen will bring "the other party" to terms. Improved implements and machinery placed in the hands of the lowest field labor in the world, has caused a decline in the price of the farmer's product he has hardly a margin of profit left. A condition is not a temporary one, but is permanent as development. The lessener is what has closed up workshops and men to be idle. As a mere matter of conservation "the other party" will be obliged to go with a trifle less bread in order to be able to earn a loaf; a trifle less profit, in order that the factory door open. This he will be too glad to do, if the case really demand and as soon as he will be convinced that it is in his interest so to do.

Dr. Middleton, in closing his remarks on free trade and protection, says:

Both are good, and useful, and need to be used, as in most other things, they bend to extremes, be wisely moderated, and in all visions aim at the common, the general, universal good.

I am in entire accord with you. You in fact, expressed the very intention of the proposition I am advocating, and which is the subject matter of our discussion.

In conclusion, Dr. Middleton says:

With your plan of scattering broadcast the continent, among all classes of the people, your very novel proposition and all its attendant points of view, you certainly should arrive at some judicious, fair, and equitable practical basis of action, that will in lessening the burdens of the common thereby increasing the common prosperity and happiness. This is an end devoutly to be desired. May you be the instrument of so great a good.

Opinion of F. SIEGEL & BROS., cloak makers, Chicago, Ill.:

My opinion on this proposition is that it should be given a trial in order to determine if practically feasible.
F. SIEGEL & BROS.

In a communication, dated December 1891, Mr. E. A. PHIPSON for the National Labor Society, London, England, says: society is in favor of the reform you propose.

Opinion of THE COLCHESTER RUBBER PANY, Colchester, Connecticut:

The plan proposed would cheapen cost of the millions, and would increase the consumption of farm and other products, adding to the prosperity and to the happiness of the people.

Opinion of Mr. J. R. ROBERTS, of the Roberts (cutlery) Manufacturing Company, West Broadway, New York:

I thank you for the exceedingly interesting pamphlet entitled "A Novel Proposition." I read it with deep interest; have been inspired by its inherent originality, and have given it thorough consideration. So laudable is the inspiring idea that there would be for me a pleasure could I concur in its arguments and adopt its conclusions. Reluctantly, but

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

am unable—except in part—to do this; and it relates solely to the injustice the agriculturist of our country are suffering through the protective tariff. Granting this "protective tariff" to be an unabolishable permanency, then, to my way of thinking, be a degree of compensatory justice in the plan for government aid to agriculture. This remedy, which I advocate, might be serviceable in the de "Like cures like;" the agriculturist be present robbed, according to law, for the benefit of other classes; those other should be correspondingly depleted to the agriculturist. I am, however, from previous conviction, a thorough-going "free-trader." My comment upon the underlying principle "A Novel Proposition" would cover the area of political economy and of "The Law of Nations." I will deal briefly. To me the following statements seem as self-evident as the law of gravity: To take under forms of law (taxation) property of one class of citizens in order to enrich another class is sheer legalized robbery. Therefore, to be equitable, should no class one iota more or one iota less be reimbursed to that class from the other. This equalization is clearly an impossibility.

It is not possible that in your endeavor to make the factor of equity, so that each should receive exactly alike, that you should ensure this equity by the measure of abstract right? Abstract right in matters of exchange is thinkable; is sometimes possible; is more often attainable by chance than by design. God alone may deal in the abstract of absolute. Human beings must ever be forced to rely on the comparative and the relative.

A manufacturer of cutlery, offering your wares for sale (call it exchange), how is your customer to judge that the price you charge is absolutely just? By two methods: He compares your make with others; and he compares the statements made to him, and by others. If the buyer does not know the exchange value of the goods, and if the seller is inclined to take advantage of the buyer, thus buys, is he not cheated? Yes. Furthermore, that the storekeeper does not cheat, but that he has been cheated, but offers the goods for sale to others claiming that his price is absolutely just, would he not be deceived were he told that he was selling a good? Now, you know the relative value of the goods, and therefore are in a measure prejudiced against an unjust exchange, but are you not informed of the proper exchange value of anything else you need? What of cloth, shirts, shoes, groceries, or furniture; do you know absolutely the exchange value of things, too? No; nor of cutlery neither. No one knows the particles composing the steel of iron, and the actual changes in each and the new qualities it took on as it is being converted into the finished pocket-knife.

You only can judge of its excellence by comparing it with other knives. And as it is impossible for you to know things absolutely, it is impossible for any other human being to know exchange value absolutely.

There is of course a chance for some object to be exchanged for a dollar. Technically this may rather be classed as an act of modulation than an exchange.

From what has been said, we may conclude that, for all human purposes, an exchange which benefits the parties involved, and to which they cheerfully give their assent, is as just as human provision can make it. Do you grant that? If you do, then, in that event, the proposition I advocate can be applied as justly as any other proposition of exchange.

Continuing, Mr. Roberts says:

Were it attainable there would be no advantage in it; the equilibrium would remain unchanged; all the taxative subtractions and offsetting compensations would be wasted labor.

Permit me to differ with you, Mr. Roberts; there would be a decided advantage. In the first place, the farmer would be benefited; this cannot be denied; and the equilibrium would not remain unchanged, for there is no equilibrium now at all. With the proposition adopted there would be no wasted labor; but, on the contrary, there would be a conservation of earning power much greater than is possible under a free trade system. Any six men given three dollars a day for work, to be equally divided among them, would give each man half a dollar a day, suppose three did not work but were to have half of the earnings of the three that did, how much would each have? Twenty-five cents per day. This is precisely what takes place in Europe, and will continue to take place as long as Europe is an "armed camp." And it is on these terms that workmen in this country must work as soon as we have free trade. You grant that of course. Yes, you may grant even more than that, for with free trade we will enter into competition with the European countries for the markets of the world. What will be the result? Are the foreign nations going to make no effort to meet our competition? They certainly will make every effort. And the point of least resistance being in the reduction of wages, wages will be reduced, and to a point that will tend to bring about anarchy.

In conclusion, Mr. Robert says:

I am convinced that not to the agriculturist only, but likewise to the nation at large, the proper remedy, the only genuine remedy, for the differential ill that we are suffering under, is for the nation to get itself as quickly as it is practicable, as close as is possible, to the principles of absolute free trade.

It is neither possible nor desirable for this nation to do anything of the kind. It is not possible, because the majority want protection. Even the "solid south," while they clamor for free trade in the abstract, want protection in the concrete. Presently, and with the growth of her manufacturing interests, the south too, will speak in no uncertain terms in favor of protection. As a general rule, the practical free trader is in favor of that system until he has something that he desires to have protected. An amusing incident of this kind occurred lately in our own State, when Mr. Wm. H. Mills, an apostle of free trade, addressed the State Board of Trade, in San Francisco, on the urgent need of obtaining greater protection for California, and Col. John P. Irish, another free trade advocate, delivered himself in a masterful manner (as a silver-tongued orator), that "California" industries should be protected.

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

There was a time in the history of our country when free trade could have been perpetuated. Had that been done, this country would not to-day have had its sixty-five millions inhabitants; it would not to-day have taken first rank among the nations. It would have been an agricultural country of about the same national importance as Holland or Belgium. That time has gone, and gone for good. Practical issues can only be evolved on the line of protection. The majority of voters in the United States are those who earn an average wage. This average wage will buy for the prudent the prime necessities of life as cheaply here as in Europe. Food, the coarser grades of domestic goods, and rent here are as cheap as in Europe. What advantage will it be to them to shave their income down to one-third or one-quarter they are receiving now? As long as this remains true, just so long will the majority maintain protection.

Opinion of the GILBERT MANUFACTURING COMPANY, manufacturers of cotton goods, New York:

The grand principle that you enunciate would be a boon to the country at large, and of course to the agriculturist; and no doubt every farmer in the land, if his attention was properly brought to this matter, would be only too glad to vote in its favor.

Would the farmer be the only one that would be glad to vote for it? Why not also the manufacturer, if by its adoption it would bring him more orders and a lesser risk? Why not the workingman, if it brought him a steady demand for labor? Why not the retail merchant, if it would enable him to sell more goods? Why would not every intelligent voter be glad to vote for it?

Opinion of THE W. L. DOUGLASS SHOE COMPANY, Brockton, Mass., dated November 3, 1893:

We have carefully examined your very interesting and novel proposition, and think it would be of much benefit, not only to farmers, but the people generally, especially those whose entire life is one of economy. The reduced freight rates would no doubt make a corresponding reduction in the cost of material transported, and, as no section of the country is entirely dependent on its surroundings for the necessities of life, why would not the great assistance the government would give to reduce the cost of these necessities, equal that already adopted in giving the brain food, by the low rate of mail transportation for newspapers and periodicals.

Opinion of MR. ALEXANDER CALDWELL, of Bill & Caldwell, hat jobbers, New York:

My opinion on this proposition is against same. It involves the populistic idea that the U. S. government should own the railroads.

You are mistaken; there is not a single argument in favor of government ownership of railroads in the pamphlet. The carrying out of this proposition no more requires that the government should own the railroad, than it should require the government to own the steamships because it collects revenue by a tariff.

Further on Mr. Caldwell says:

I fail to see why such a marked discrimination should be made against the poor farmer in the eastern and Middle States. The old, barren, called New England, where the pilgrims landed to-day a desert waste, as the poor farmer has crushed and cast aside in competition with the farmer of the west.

Again you are mistaken; the New England farmer has not been crushed out by any one. He is not of the "crushed out" kind. He has simply "swapped" his little New England farm for a great western ranch (we have a number of them here). Some others gave up their little New England farm and moved to the New England cities, and started into manufacturing, and by the kindly assent of the government, and through the privileges of the protective tariff (chiefly through, the tariff became manufacturers, and some even hat jobbers.

As soon, however, as the first division proposition is adopted, namely: that some farm products, in limited weight and value, be carried by the postoffice at one cent a pound, the poor relations of the now rich descendants of the pilgrims will again flock to the "deserted" New England farms, and find a new, almost boundless field for profit in doing a fine "mail order" business. Especially so will be the case as soon as the two other divisions of the proposition herein advocated are adopted. For thereby the southern and western farmer will prosper, and this prosperity will bring the New England cities very many more orders for skilled labor manufactures, and the increased prosperity of New England cities will increase the prosperity of the New England farmer.

Further on Mr. Caldwell says:

You say the tariff protects manufacturers but does not protect agriculturists. Simply because there is no competition on coal at Newcastle; and, as was, a tariff would protect wheat as it now protects sugar.

You are mistaken again. There is competition on wheat, and the sharpest kind of competition, for the American wheat grower competes in the open market with the priced field labor of the world. And, as it is necessary for us to export, we would do the farmer the least bit of good if we substituted for a tariff that my proposition is advocated.

Again Mr. Caldwell says:

Remove the tariff on hats and not a factor in the United States could keep their doors open. It is because the labor on the other side can make hats so much cheaper. But how about the farmer? Can he take his wheat to London and get in the pockets of the world cash, in making his competition against the whole world. But we cannot take wheat to London.

Just so, and the time has come when the farmer and cotton can no longer be produced for profit, simply because the labor (with its implements) on the other side can produce wheat and cotton so much cheaper. Rome Madden, Land Agent of the S. P. in a recent report says: "With wheat at the present price, what encouragement is there to a man to plant when it is known that he will net him a deficit instead of a profit. True we get cash for wheat, but were the farmers to receive no more profit on hats

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

ed on wheat, then "not a hat factory in nited States could keep its doors open." view of the facts, ought not wheat and to receive the same measure of protec- s hats do?

nion of L. C. WARNER, of Warner Bros., t Manufacturers, New York, says:

pinion on this proposition is adverse for the ing reasons: Either the products must be car- a great deal below actual cost, or else it must a great hardship to those shipping but short ces. So great a hardship, in fact, that they prefer to send their produce by wagons rather o pay the railroad rates.

re will be no more necessity for those ing but short distances to send their pro- to market by wagon than there is at the nt time. In place of suffering a hard- the farmers near the great cities will be itted to the degree that the great cities which they are located will be benefitted. ave, therefore, only to determine as to er the great cities will be benefitted if armers of the southwest and north are itted. I claim that they will. Further r. Warner says:

ipped below cost, some one must pay for it. me one, of course, would be, first, the Gov- nt, and, second, the people who support the ment. Such a law would cause the people to a railroad recklessly for long distances where ere getting transportation below cost, and the would pay in increased taxes to meet this s and extravagant expenditure much more ey would save in the cheap freights.

ainly some one must pay for it. When nited States Government places a pro- tariff on corsets, prohibiting Austrian erman goods to come into competition our industry, collecting heavy duties on that come, and permitting you to manu- e and sell your corsets at a much higher ho pays for it? Do you? No, for an rate of profit squares that. Does the ngman whom you employ pay for it? ecause he receives, say, \$2 a day for labor, in Austria he would receive 25 cents. then, pays for it? Who but the farmer ple products. He alone sells his product e trade prices, and he competes, not like o with the Austrian 25-cents-a-day man, ith the India and Egypt 5-cents-a-day Is this just?

or recklessness in shipping, if the rates ow, you would be correct if the low rates placed on street-car fares, or on merry- nds for children. Even then the reck- ss would cease as soon as the novelty of w rates would have worn out. No sane r would be reckless in shipping wheat or a. And if they were even inclined to be e law could step in and stop them.

her objection to the plan is that it would be an discrimination in favor of farm products and t all manufactured products.

l is there not at the present time an un- discrimination in favor of manufactures inst staple farm products? And if there ould not the unjust be made just? v can it be made just? Either by free

trade or by protection; and if by protection, agriculture, as well as manufactures, ought to receive an equal measure of protection, and no more.

Opinion of MR. A. KROGER, of S. Worthing- ton & Co., importers and manufacturers of millinery, New York:

Your statement that the farmer is not protected, ignores the import duty on hay, barley, potatoes, butter, cheese, eggs, etc.

Yes, I ignored the fact, because I did not deem it necessary to state that the articles you mention were protected. Wheat is also protected by the tariff. But can you tell me of what earthly value a tariff is on exports? I presume you are aware that if the entire crop of wheat of the Union was 100 bushels, and if only 10 bushels were exported, that the remain- ing 90 sold at home, together with the 10 export- ed, would all be sold at the Liverpool price. Of what value, then, is a tariff on staple farm products, a portion of which is exported? Can you tell me? No, nor any one else. Now if you are to reply, saying, "If producing staples does not pay, why produce them?" the answer would be, unless we export agricultural products what else have we to export—is it mill- nery? And unless we export something in return for our imports, we shall be obliged to pay out all our gold; when that shall have been paid out, then our silver, then our cop- per, and then good-bye. Or shall we cease importing? Personally, I can do without tea, coffee, silks, velvets, French walking canes, kid gloves, or eye glasses. Now, if you and the rest of the people of the Union can do like- wise, this part of the problem is solved.

It is of course unfortunate that a great State like California, with its fine climate and soil conditions, should, through its geographical position, be debarred from enjoying the advantages of the best of markets, but the remedy rests with natural developments and with its people, and is a problem for them to solve.

Yes, it is unfortunate, and it is true that the remedy rests with its people. It is a problem for them to solve. You have an evidence that they are trying to solve it, however, in the fact that you were asked, by your opinion, to help solve it.

The adoption of the proposition under con- sideration is an attempt at a solution, and this solution, if adopted, will not alone solve the problem for California, but will solve it for the south and the entire west. And when it is solved, the manufacturing cities will gain vastly more in increased commerce, and labor in steady demand, than the cost to them in the indirect tax taken from the receipts re- ceived for protection.

Opinion of MESSRS. LAWRENCE, WEBSTER & Co., manufacturers of cloth, Malone, New York:

Your plan is feasible and would work great good to a large number of agriculturists.

If to agriculturists, why not to manufactur- ers, workingmen, merchants, professional men—every one?

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

MR. E. P. DODGE, President of the Newburyport Shoe Company, Newburyport, Mass., concludes his communication as follows:

The Newburyport Shoe Company, as represented by its active managers, would be much interested in your proposition if it included the transportation of its shoes to California at a nominal rate. We should hope to sell you many more goods under such conditions, and trust that the disadvantage we are now under will not prevent us from selling you many more in the future than we have been able to heretofore.

Now this caps the climax! The farmer is not alone asked to buy shoes which are protected by a tariff, and in addition thereto by the Labor Union, but Mr. Dodge is willing to have his shoes further protected by having them carried to California at a nominal freight rate. Mr. Dodge, you are to be congratulated on your boundless ambition. But let me tell you right now, that if shoes even come here free of freight charges, and at a reduction in price even so low as to materially effect your profits, and in so doing you were compelled to lower the wages of your employees in a marked degree, even then I would not place an order, unless the trade made it necessary.

Those in large manufacturing centers are apt to take the barber, the banker, the groceryman for "the trade." And the manufacturer often makes the mistake of taking the retailer as "the trade." The retailer, however, knows better; he knows that he is not "the trade," nor is the barber or banker "the trade." "The trade" is the condition of the farmer. Whenever his crop is poor; when his returns are meagre; whenever he loses money, then look sharp to your accounts.

Cheap freight on manufactures? Of what avail is that? A short time ago the rates on clothing and shoes were \$4 50, on hats \$3 30, and on millinery \$3 50 a hundred pounds, and business was flourishing. High wages were paid, and the Newburyport Shoe Company sold lots of shoes. The rate has since been reduced to \$1 60 per hundred, and trade did not progress upward with the decline in freight on merchandise, but on the contrary it took a decided downward turn. Why? Because the southern cotton planter sold his cotton at too small a margin of profit. The same is the case with the California wheat grower. The farmer has been "howling calamity" for so many years, and now, when he has really struck "calamity," the public will not believe him. "Calamity" it will continue to be; an honest "calamity," and full of evil results, unless one of two things be done: Either take the modern implements out of the hands of the coolie, the fahah, and the mujik (into whose hands they have been placed within recent years), or else protect the agricultural interests as manufacture is protected.

You talk of a reduction of rates on shoes. What would you say to a charge of \$7 50 for a \$2 pair of shoes for carriage from Newburyport to Sacramento? Impossible? Well, that is just the percentage rate in the carriage of fruits from California to New York. Three and one-half cents a pound is the average price offered here for fruits delivered in New York. The grower on accepting the same (which he does) pays 24 cents for carriage on passenger time.

This rate is not high on shoes, because shoes average a value of \$3 a pound, but products are scarce that many cents per pound. Observe the difference in value and weight. For the past nine years I have endeavored to have the railroad company carry fruits free of cost, and charge the loss on merchandises without avail.

Out of this and by an extension of the same grew the proposition I am now advocating, and that is to tax imported parasols, bonnets, pictures, and luxuries, and apply this tax in reducing the rates on farm products, to enable the farmer to earn a living in that wages may be maintained and commerce fostered. And in time many more advantages will spring up, not alone from among the farmers, but from the ranks of labor, from the professions, from among the people who wish to see this country prosper.

Opinion of PROFESSOR J. M. McEVROY, LL.B., late Lecturer on Political Economy at the University of Toronto, Canada:

The scheme, it seems to me, would only serve itself to a discipline of protective tariffs. The market price for American agricultural products is fixed by the Liverpool and London prices. It is evident that no tariff arrangement that the United States could make would raise or lower that price; on the other hand, it is plain that in the case of manufactured goods it would increase competition among the consumers within the United States, checked to some extent by the cost of production that regulates the price of manufactured goods, and that a protective tariff would raise the price of such goods, thus giving the advantage over the agricultural producer. This proposition looks like an attempt to overcome this manifest injustice in the protective system without doing away with protection.

Mr. Lubin seems to assume that despotic governments make and keep wages low. No wages are low in countries where there are despotic governments. That the one is the cause of the other is the principal cause for the other is not demonstrated.

How can it be otherwise? Is there a greater robber than despotic power?

The statement recently made by the United States Agricultural Department in Mr. Cleveland's report has, if it be accurate, an important relation to this question. The probability is that the vast tracts of new land that were available to the American wage-earners at all periods of the present had more to do with keeping wages in the United States than did any particular form of government. Mr. Cleveland's report says in his recent report that practically all the available farming lands in the United States have been taken up. Now, let population in the United States become as dense as it is in China, and it will require a more powerful engine of government to keep up wages.

As China proper has 1,297,880 square miles and a population of 382,000,000, and the United States has 3,557,000 square miles, and 65,000,000 population, there is not the least ground for the fears of the Professor on that score. At least not for the next couple of thousand years. Wages were kept up because there was a demand for labor.

Mr. Cleveland's Minister was certainly taken. There is plenty of government

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

away with strife, and that will be another "blessing."

The principal blessing, however, will be in the fact that a prosperous agricultural condition will be a safe guarantee that our republican form of government will survive, and in surviving will continue to develop, until in the fullness of time her grand destiny of elevating and humanizing to the highest standard not alone her own citizens, but the whole human race be achieved.

Opinion of WAUKENHOSE CO., Boston, Mass., manufacturers of hosiery, as expressed by W. C. Lewis, Treasurer:

My opinion on this proposition is that the postal facilities should embrace express companies; work all parcels up to certain proper limit of weight, etc.

Opinion of THE J. E. STEVENS COMPANY, iron goods manufacturers, Cromwell, Conn.:

In some way the farmers should receive help to prevent unreasonable demands from the railroad managers.

Is it not a fact that the most unreasonable demand is made on the farmer when, from the earnings of his staple products, he is compelled to pay for protection? Do not the real or alleged unreasonable demands by railroad companies sink into insignificance when compared to this? Are you willing to accept, yes, even compel, protection for your industry at the sole expense of the producer of staple farm products, and yet deny him the right of protection at the expense of your industry? This may be human nature, but is it justice? No; and whatever is unjust is, in the long run, impolitic. Where will the demand for iron goods come from when the farmers are crippled? Will it come from the retailers? Will it come from the city people? These are only a drop in the bucket; and the bucket would soon be dry unless replenished by the trade of the farmer and field-hand. Give him the measure of protection which he is entitled to, as long as your industry is protected, and there will be many more orders for iron goods than now. Your accounts, too, will be safer, for the best guarantee for commercial accounts is the solvency and prosperity of the farmer.

Further on The J. E. Stevens Company says:

We agree most heartily with you, but cannot see that the proposed plan is the way to do it. There is a difference between twenty and three thousand miles, that is not easily overcome.

I agree with you, too; there is a vast difference between twenty and three thousand miles. It is this very difference in the great distance from the market that makes a farm twenty miles from London more valuable than one in Turkestan, in Asia. And yet Turkestan is no further from England than is California from New York.

And the same conditions that cause wages to be lower in Turkestan than in England will also lower the wage rate in the great western and northwestern portions of the United States. There was a time in this section when wages

were high, but that was when the prod of products sent to the great market cities in limited quantities. But as these prices increase largely, the returns to the individual producer keep on declining. To meet the decline one of two things have to be done: transportation must be lowered, or the wage rate decline. Should the wage rate decline, lower the degree of civilization, not all the great west and northwest, but in the England States as well. For, as you well know, a lessened wage rate to millions of farm will diminish the demand for skilled workers east, and thus defeat the very purpose of a protective tariff more effectually than trade. For there is no civilized country in the world that has the immense distances to traverse before reaching the market than has this. That wages for field work have not yet fallen to a minimum rate is because production has not yet reached its maximum. That it is slowly but surely approaching. And the cause that will prevent the inevitable is the lowering of the transportation cost from the remote distances on farm products and to continue doing this until a measure has been arrived at. This, together with the protective tariff, will permit a market wage rate, not alone for field labor, but for manufactures.

In conclusion, The J. E. Stevens Company says:

We understand that the merchandise handled by mail is at a loss; and if so, cannot stand how the system may be enlarged to the extent as named.

Yes, it is so understood; but why car dresses, neckties, fans or bonnets at a price? Why should they go by mail at all? Consider the practical results to wages and commerce the forwarding of thousands of tons of novels through the postoffice at one pound, with the carrying of fruits, flowers, eggs, and other non-staple farm products (the same as is done in England and many). The trashy novels help to fill out the mail, whereas the adoption of "classification" of this proposition in the forwarding of non-farm products by the Postoffice Department at one cent a pound, will render the same highly profitable. It will enable the farmer to earn more on ten acres than he can on fifty acres. The mail facilities will permit him to reach the consumer direct, and permit him to do a "mail order business" same as is done by dozens of great dry goods houses, and to the greater benefit of the country.

Opinion of LESTER J. SAUL, Esq., of J. Saul & Co., manufacturers at Albany, New York, November 4, 1893:

There is no good and just reason as to why government should not supply as liberally as it wants and necessities of the farming industry. It does in a certain measure to so-called live stock as you choose to term it. I feel that in giving the farmer and crop grower every facility and aid for carrying their products to the market, we not only benefit them but the country large, thereby meaning its citizens and commerce. If it means the increase, to a certain extent, in the taxation, do we not save a certain percentage of this in the reduced cost of produc-

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

part of this cost means transportation charges) thereby bringing to our tables the same foods at the reduced price?

I beg to differ with you in your theory of distribution of wealth. I am of the opinion that if to do such a thing were possible with the entire wealth of this world, to equally divide share and share alike, that it would only be a question of time when all this would find itself in the same channels and thence to the same coffers that contain it at present. This part of your proposition strikes me as impracticable.

So it would; but I nowhere advocated any such distribution. By revolutionizing the distribution of wealth, I mean that the present method, as now in operation, which takes from the producer of staple products his rightful earnings and places the same in other hands should be changed. This is a distribution of wealth that is as unjust as it is impolitic, for when the farmer is despoiled of his means, not he alone, but manufacture and labor is also caused to suffer. Now, then, to restore to the farmer what belongs to him is but doing justice; and this, when done, will be a revolution from the present methods in the distribution of wealth. This is what I advocate, and not what you thought I did.

Opinion of PROFESSOR JAMES MAVOR, Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto, Canada (lately of the University of Edinburgh):

This classification disregards value entirely, and would presumably involve the transportation of grapes, wheat, pomegranates and other dissimilar produce at a uniform rate.

Not necessarily; I did not deem it my duty to work out the detail so as to show just what difference there should be in the carriage of wheat or grapes. There will be time enough for this when the general plan is endorsed.

That there will be differences in the transportation charges for products varying in bulk, value and kind, there can be no question.

In relation to Classification One, Professor Mavor has this to say:

If the transportation of books at 1 cent a pound pays, it may be that the transportation of anything at 1 cent a pound would pay; but the average weight of a book is only a few ounces, and, to make the parallel exact, consignments of other goods would have to be restricted to a similar average weight per package.

Professor Mavor is evidently under the impression that novels forwarded by publishers are mailable only one at a time. If he is, he is mistaken. A case of books, weighing a hundred pounds, is forwarded by mail at one cent a pound for any distance in the United States, as well as single novels under separate covers.

Now the advocate of Classification One of this proposition has set a limit to his ambition in the direction of weight and bulk, and would be satisfied to start with a limit of five pounds, in the hope that ultimately the German limit of ten pounds would prevail.

Continuing, Professor Mavor says:

If the transportation of small packages at such a rate does not pay expenses, the loss would have to be made up from other revenue-producing services, or from taxation.

Certainly. This is just what is being now. It costs the people several million dollars a year to carry merchandise, newspapers and novels. Every man, woman and child in the United States is taxed to make up this deficiency. I will quote from the forepart of pamphlet: There is no valid reason (than wanton wickedness or profound stupidity) that will deny the right to fruits and flour, butter, cheese or vegetables, and cheer give it to such vile trash as "The World and the Devil," "A Crown of Shame," "The Old Man's Secret," "Wife in N Only," "Professional Thieves," "Cam Fair Women," "The Burglar's Fate," "Rogue's Life," "Mollie Maguires," "Ruffi Strikers and Communists," "A Mo Circe," "Bank Robbers," etc., etc., etc.

Now, if the people are to be taxed for efficiency at all, let them be taxed for somewhat more sensible and more profitable.

Classification One, when adopted, will be a revenue, not alone to the farmer, but to consumer, and its benefits will permeate the workshop and the humble home. Alone that, the rich will share equally in benefits. All the people will be benefited.

Further on Professor Mavor says:

"Classification Two." This is the chief principle. Uniform rates per unit of weight for all dist have been suggested before for all goods, but not aware that anyone has seriously proposed to apply them to farm produce alone.

No, nor am I aware; hence I named pamphlets "A Novel Proposition."

Continuing, Professor Mavor says:

If there were any advantage in uniform rates would obviously be unfair to apply them to one description of goods and not to all others.

Viewing the matter from the point of precedent, you are right, but when viewed from economic standard, independent of any existing custom, there is room to doubt the all unfairness.

Is it unfair to give the workman a steady demand for labor? Is it unfair to supply manufacturer with orders? Is it unfair to increase the volume of commerce? Is it unfair to render agriculture self-sustaining? If unfair, then it is fair, and if fair, the present system must be unfair. And it is unfair, ruinous, and impolitic, and unprogressive.

The cause of the unfairness of the present system has its root in the unequal value between a given bulk and weight of manufactured goods and farm products in their native state. And it is for this reason that a dollar dress pattern may cross the continent for one dollar, and ten dollars' worth of fruits (by passenger time) at twenty-five dollars.

Nor is this all, for increased production lowers the selling price, hence the ratio of cost to transportation keeps on increasing in a metric degree.

The evening up or leveling process, being the point of least resistance, finds that path in the reduction of wages, and, besides, in the lessened margin of profit to the producer.

Now, the average manufacturer is likely to trouble himself very little about the reduction of wages, or the amount of profit any one may receive, especially anyone so remote

(Opinions and clippings, or comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

his interests as the farmer or farm hand. He believes that he is performing his whole duty in attending to his own business.

It becomes, therefore, the duty of the political economist to point out to him a law which will show the error of his conclusion. That law may be stated in the following words:

The margin of profit of the primary industry (agriculture) is the source for the support of the secondary industry (manufacture). The volume of the former determines the latter.

This law, once understood, will change the opinion of very many in favor of the proposition herein advocated, who are now opposed to it, or of others who are indifferent about it.

Opinion of C. N. CHADWICK, of Foy, Harmon Chadwick, corset manufacturers, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

My opinion on this proposition is that it is too vast a subject to answer off hand. The proposition is entirely novel and certainly should demand careful investigation, but why not go a step further? If you would carry freight at a uniform rate all over the United States, why not transport the individual also? Possibly it might be better to have centers of uniform delivery within a radii of, say, 200 or 300 miles. On the whole, I like the idea and think it should be worked out.

This proposition is not intended to carry all freights at the reduced rates, but simply farm products in their natural state. All other freights (and individuals) are protected by the tariff, whereas staple farm products are not.

It also provides for the entire or partial elimination of the factor of increased charge for distance and transportation on all farm products that may be classed as non-staples, because the value of farm products compared with their weight is much lower than on manufactures, thus: a suit of clothes may average \$2 a pound, whereas potatoes or fruit scarcely average that many cents per pound; and while manufactures can safely stand the high freight rates, products from remote distances cannot.

Opinion of H. G. HUBERT, Orange, Cal.:

Until reading your proposition I was against protection, because as it is now practiced it is only for the benefit of those who have the greatest "pull" upon Congress to obtain their legislation for the benefit of the special industry of the "applicant," and it is a crying injustice to the rest of the citizens. Now that you open, by your proposition, a way of also protecting the prime producer—the farmer—I am for protection first, as soon as possible, and last, until we get international understanding and enough charity on this earth for man to live and let live.

Opinion of J. C. SMITH, of T. B. Peddie & Co., manufacturers of trunks and valises, 368 Broadway, New York:

My opinion on this proposition is that it would be of great benefit to the farmers, but at the expense of those engaged in other industries.

True. The same thing can now truthfully be said by the farmer of staple products under existing conditions. Your trunks and valises protected and the farmer must, in buying

them, pay you protection prices, whereas his wheat and cotton can be bought by you at Liverpool prices. You see, therefore, that it is a one-sided affair, the producer of staple farm products substantially pays for your protection. This is not just, is it? No, nor is it politic, for you hamper thereby the prosperity of the farmer, and this hampering prevents him from paying liberal wages to his farm hands. The lessened net return to the farmer and farm hand reduce their purchasing power. The retail dealer consequently does a smaller volume of trade, and that mainly in the lower grades of goods, thereby reducing the demand for skilled labor.

Opinion of MR. JAMES GAUNT, of Gaunt & Jauvier, agents of Pears' soap for the United States, 365 and 367 Canal street, New York:

You claim, and I think justly, that if novels be forwarded by the government at a nominal rate, there is no good reason why peaches should not be. You claim that if it be right to protect manufacturers, it is right to protect producers of farm products. My ground of objection lies in the fact that I deny your premises. There is no reason why novels should be carried by the government, and there is no reason why manufacturers should be protected. I distinctly object to a paternal form of government.

You are certainly consistent, but the question is would your ideas on free trade, if carried out, be in the best interests of our country? With free trade, what would prevent the wage rate of our country declining to the level of the average wage rate of Europe?

Nothing. Should you conclude that the reduced wage rate will purchase as much under free trade as the higher rate will under protection, you will certainly be mistaken.

As the great staple farm products are exported from this country to Europe, they are of necessity cheaper here than there.

Therefore no saving could be made in that. Staple manufactures are almost as cheap in our country as in Europe.

There is no doubt that by free trade, gloves, walking canes and meerscham pipcs would be cheaper, but by the time we have free trade and our working men are reduced to European wages, they will not alone have no money to buy these things with, but they will have precious little to buy anything else with. Besides, free trade by shutting up American workshops will do away with a strong competitor to any future grasping demand of European manufacturers as soon as they shall have secured our trade. Prices may then rise as high under free trade as under protection.

Free trade would rapidly diminish our strength and standing as a nation, would tend towards revolution and retrogression, and would only benefit the European manufacturer.

Protection will conserve the highest and best interests of our country, but in order that this may be done protection should be just. If manufacture is to be protected, it should not be at the expense of agriculture. Let both interests be protected.

As for paternalism, there are degrees when paternalism becomes dangerous to a republican form of government, and there are degrees

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

when it serves a beneficial purpose in conserving the same.

A government without any paternalism whatever is a government without public schools, without a post office, without a patent office, without anything other than jails, prisons, policemen and a chief policeman at its head. Where the hangman performs the chief functions of the State, I would not like such a government. Would you? And yet such is any government having absolutely no degree of paternalism. The full measure of paternalism in its highest application is as pictured by Bellamy in his "Looking Backward," but this form of government is only practicable when all mankind will be absolutely just, unselfish, benevolent and high-minded. It is, however, probable that a few thousand years will elapse before this is realized. Paternalism with a vengeance, and in all its vivid reality and beastliness in full blast is to be found in Russia.

Being a free people, enjoying a representative form of government, under a Constitution which guarantees our liberties as long as we chose to have them guaranteed, we need fear no greater danger in granting protection to agriculture than in our protecting manufacture. Justice and good policy demand it.

That protection as a policy in the interests of the people does not overstep the limits of safe paternalism may be inferred from the intent of the framers of our form of government when, in the preamble to the Constitution, they used the words, "and to promote the general welfare."

Opinion of Mr. LOUIS EISENDRATH, of Strauss, Eisendrath & Drom, manufacturers of boys' clothing, Chicago, Ill.:

Your proposition as to the transportation of farm products in the same manner as mail matter is transported is a novel one, and certainly would be of great benefit to farmers and producers in California, but would work great harm and injustice to producers and growers in this and other states east of the Rocky Mountains.

Why would it not also be a benefit to Nevada, Oregon, Louisiana, North Dakota, Florida, in fact to the south, the west, and northwest? And if a benefit to them, what will they do with the "benefit?" Will they not quickly distribute it almost as fast as they receive it? To whom will the "benefits" be distributed? To whom else but to the large eastern cities. What will become of the "benefit" then? Will not the large eastern cities distribute portions of it to the near by farmers?

The product of Europe pours into London, and yet that does not diminish the value of a 100-acre ranch within ten miles of London. The diminution of wage earners there to a marked degree would, however, soon reduce its value. No; the eastern farmer would never suffer through western or southern prosperity. Do they not suffer in an even ratio whenever the south and west suffers?

Further on Mr. Eisendrath says:

Another most important point you seem to overlook, and that is the fact that this would be altogether a one-way business for the railroads or the government, whoever would undertake it, as you, in your proposition, ask for equalized transportation rates on farm products only, and as a

matter of course none of the eastern States and large centers ship fruit to California, nor grain to the northern Dakotas, or cotton to Mississippi; would therefore simply be as stated above, entirely one sided. If you will include in your proposition that the same rates of transportation shall apply on the production of mines, on article of merchandise (when in their original state as really agricultural products), then well and good but otherwise it seems to me that a rule that works but one way is not a good one.

Well, since you wish it, we will measure your argument by your last clause—"a rule that works one way is not a good one. Could you manufacture boys' clothing under free trade, and pay the same rate of wages you do now? Or would Austrian and German boy clothing be cheaper? If now the United States government enables your industry to flourish by reason of protection, who pays for that protection? Your industry? Yes; but does it not pay itself back in higher profit? Certainly! Do your workpeople? Yes; but do they not receive it back with an addition in higher wages. Certainly. Now we find it so throughout until we come to the producer of staple farm products. He, too, pays the higher price; but how does he get it back? Can you answer? Do you not see that because he is compelled to sell his product on the free trade system, by the Liverpool quotations, that he (the farmer) is the only one who pays for protection, but receives nothing for it? No; a rule that works one way is not alone not good, but is in addition not just, not honest. And in the face of this state of affairs do you also propose to have the farmer help pay to reduce the rates on manufactures? There ought to be some limit to ambition, even if it seems to some laudable.

Opinion of A. T. HADLEY, M.A., Professor of Political Economy and Dean of Courses of Graduate Instruction, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.:

If the farmer who occupies distant land is to enjoy transportation at a nominal price, why should not the farmer who occupies poor land be furnished manure at a nominal price?

I shall frankly state that I know of no reason why farmers who occupy poor lands should not be furnished with manure at a nominal price. Nor does the question interest me sufficiently to ask the professor why. I can, however, give reasons why farmers who occupy distant lands should enjoy transportation at nominal rates:

Assuming such farmers raise non-staple products, they should enjoy nominal rates, because the law on freight is that all manufactured goods have the cost for transportation (with a profit on that cost) added to their original cost. Farm products, however, have the cost for transportation deducted to bring them down to the market price.

To illustrate: A piano costing in New York \$100, for which \$20 has been paid for transportation to California, is figured by the merchant here as costing \$120 "to lay down," on all which he will charge a profit. Peaches quoted in New York at \$3.50 per hundred gives the New Jerseyman \$3.40 net, and gives the Californian \$1. The difference in receipts having

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

If Frenchmen are so opposed to our protective tariff, why do they not first do away with protection in France before they work themselves up to a pitch of indignation about our protection. "Those that live in glass a house should not throw stones."

Opinion of REV. BARNARD A. ELZAS, B. A.,
Sacramento, Cal.:

Your proposition is an effort to grapple with one of the most important questions in the crisis of American history through which we are now passing. In spite of all objectors, I consider that you have indisputably proven two very important propositions: (1) that the producer of staple farm products to-day is the only one in the United States who pays for protection and who gets nothing in return—a manifest injustice which cries out for remedy; and (2) that the prosperity of the artisan and farmer rise and fall together.

Your second edition embodies three distinct propositions:

Classification 1 will appeal to every one. It is not novel, as you have shown, but it would be the means of affecting enormously the welfare of the small farmer, whom it is to the interest of this Republic to see in a prosperous condition.

Classification 2. Your closely-reasoned argument appeals to me sound, and if men could be brought—always a difficult matter—to suffer a slight present disadvantage, with a view to the ultimate general good, much of the opposition against it would vanish.

Classification 3. This seems to me to be the most difficult of accomplishment. It is to be questioned whether the remedy suggested would be of a permanent nature, or whether only a temporary advantage at best. But this would be better than nothing.

Looking at your idea in the light in which we should upon every effort to benefit humanity. I trust that your propositions, even though they may have to be modified, will be earnestly discussed throughout the country and speedily acted upon.

Opinion of THE BARKER MANUFACTURING
Co., 38 Friendship Street, Providence, R. I.:

Why not equally protect this great interest, upon which we all depend more than all others for our very existence?

LAW OFFICE JULIAN P. JONES, }
ELLSWORTH, Cal. }

DAVID LUBIN, Esq., Sacramento, Cal.—DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you sincerely for the favor of your pamphlet, "A Novel Proposition." I have examined it carefully from cover to cover, taking it up from my desk at odd moments, with the thread of its discourse in my mind more or less of the time since starting upon it, and whatever may be the outcome, feel that it has cleared my mind of many conclusions, in part or wholly erroneous—we are so apt to accept the existing as right, simply because it does exist. At times with you, and again in serious doubt as I have proceeded, I lay down the pamphlet convinced that, formulated and enforced with the wisdom we of right expect, not always getting, more's the pity, of those to whom we have entrusted governmental affairs, an era of universal prosperity would follow such as this country has never seen, and impossible in any other.

Respectfully,
JULIAN P. JONES.

Opinion of MR. WM. VANDER POEST, New
York:

My opinion on this proposition is that the plan is a good one, worthy of the attention of all think-

ers, and feasible because of its simplicity. is no doubt that soon something must be done to assist the farmer. He is struggling now for existence, owing to circumstances over which he has no control. Any plan to further his interests should arrest the attention of every citizen who should co-operate to extend this cause.

We, the undersigned resident property-owners of the Edgewood School District, near A. Placer county, California, in public meeting assembled, do hereby indorse to the fullest extent set forth by Mr. David Lubin in his pamphlet "Novel Proposition," Edgewood, near A. Placer county, California. F. M. Varden, Beecher, F. Closs, T. B. Gibson, G. M. Hill, Jacob, Norman Logan, C. D. Storrs, W. J. Don, A. C. Keeler, E. S. Renny, W. J. Mc C. A. Young, C. K. Turner, R. Ernest A. G. Turner, S. P. Beecher.

The above is the first of a series of propositions that has reached me from various sections.

Opinion of J. W. SCOTT, Santa Maria,
Cal.:

I received your most welcome pamphlet some time ago and I must say it meets with my approval here. If I can assist you with this in any way I shall be happy to do so.

Yes, you can assist; assist yourself a little the nation onward in the career of progress.

Appoint yourself a committee of one, on your armor, and do not give up the fight until victory is here.

ATLANTIC & PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.,
DAGGETT, Cal., October 18, 1908.
MR. D. LUBIN, Sacramento, Cal.—DEAR MR. LUBIN: I have read your novel proposition over several times and am greatly pleased with it. You have sounded the key that will awaken the abused farmer and laborer to a full sense of their wrongs, and that it will eventually lead to the end desired. But you have taken a burden upon your hands and will receive much and adverse criticism from a subsidized press, the interest of a greedy horde of capitalists. I beseech you, let the good work go on, and believe that the day is not far distant when the masses of the American people will rise and call you—and all who have worked for the cause—blessed. Send me a number of your papers, please. I want to send them south and distribute them here. Yours truly,
W. J. PARKER.

Opinion of MR. G. B. HARTMUS, Marion
county, Oregon:

I cannot see why the products of the soil should not be treated with the same consideration given to manufacturing. Of course, the farmer must be agitated at all public gatherings in order to get the people to understand it properly.

From MR. C. M. KIRBY, Committee
meeting at Dixon, Cal.:

I warn you beforehand that you will find a Dixon audience different from those of any town of its size. It is the boast that this vicinity is peopled by more intelligent and shrewder citizens than the average town. The speakers have testified to the fact. You will feel great satisfaction if you can convince many here of the practicability of your proposition.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

el a great satisfaction," for resolutions ly favoring the proposition were passed unanims vote of all present, and the "in-nt" and "shrewd" citizens of Dixon n the hall at the meeting.

tion of Dr. EDWARD ENGEL, Hafenplatz rlin, Germany (member of the Reich-

lerstood the scheme of Mr. Lubin as some- like another one advocated some 20 years Germany—the transport of goods not ex- cording to distance, but on the "zone sys- This is possible; and I, in my books "Eisen- forum" and "Zonentarif" have recommend- the transport of passengers. But never had the least idea that the so-called "gov- nt," which in this case means nothing else a pocket of my neighbor, ought to pay for

7 would not pay it for you, doctor, unless ere a farmer; and if you were, and raised farm products in the United States, you by the adoption of the proposition ad- herein only be receiving back an equiv- or the amount the protective tariff sys- ould cost you.

her on Dr. Engel says:

1 nevertheless glad to see to what conse- is the protectionist system in the United must logically—if there is such a thing as n it—lead. Certainly if the manufactures oney, through legislation, out of the pock- he consumers, why should the farmer stay l? My sympathies are at any rate more on de of the farmers if, in the United States, neral stealing system has to be continued. nder whether Dr. Engel calls German tion a "stealing system" also? Now, as a rule the American people would foster the good will and opinion of Ger- Frenchmen, Englishmen, Austrians, hers of foreign nations, we are compelled w the line when it comes to protection to can labor. We find that it would be im- le to accommodate them by granting their wish in doing away with protection. because the majority want it, and in our y the majority rule; second, because it not be politic to do away with it. There time in the history of our country when ade could have prevailed, and even have erpetuated, but that time has gone, and or good. Had free trade been the estab-

order we would not have grown in so a time to a nation of 65,000,000; we would been an insignificant agricultural coun- Now we are strong, and our strength not erves a useful purpose in human devel- it for our own country, but has the same cy in the development of other nations. the United States mail as an instance. e departure of a ship from an American o any foreign country, not the least sig- it freight aboard is the United States mail

Millions of letters are received annually eign countries from American homes, tend to gladden the hearts and give re- hope to those who aspire to a higher n than obtains for them in the land of irth. Many hundred thousand in addi- ceive substantial evidences of American sity and liberality in the form of remit-

tances from friends and relations, without which they would perhaps be driven to shame or starvation.

Yes, doctor, the United States mail, as some would express it here, "is getting in its work," and which in time will have its effect. Cannot Dr. Engel perceive that our country is working towards a universal emancipation; an emancipation that must ultimately establish univer- sal free trade? Free trade may be safely adopted among equals. Where are now the equals? Is it France? Did she not but lately yell herself hoarse in welcoming the represen- tatives of the most vile and barbarous despot- ism on the face of the earth? What affinity can there be between a republic such as ours and a country such as France, when she strikes hands and signs contracts of friendship with a nation like Russia? A nation whose principal achievement consists in condemning its unfor- tunate people to a state of constant and pro- found ignorance. Oh, bloody, merciless Rus- sia. Oh, tyrant incarnate. Oh, land where free speech is throttled; where the poor are systematically robbed by its robber ruler; where terrible famine is a constant visitor; where the knout is as merciless as the wolf; where indel- ible scars of laceration are imprinted on the naked backs of children, on women, and on men. A land where the procession of sorrow- stricken prisoners chained hand and foot ever pursue onward the terrible march to Siberia. A land where gloom, superstition, and terror is the normal condition of its unfortunate peo- ple. A land whose pestilential prisons are the breeding places for the plague. A land whose annual dividends to other nations is in death- dealing cholera.

Speak! oh, widows and orphans of Ham- burg, what was it that sent your beloved ones to a dreaded and untimely death? What but cholera, and from Russia's vile prisons. How much longer will such a land be permitted to pollute God's footstool? No; we cannot take France as an equal. Nor Germany, because she is an "armed camp." Nor Austria, for the same reason. Nor even England, because her ports are open to the others.

The time may come when free trade may prevail but not yet. We must wait until the development of the American Republic has reached that exalted condition which the ALL- JUST FATHER OF NATIONS intended it should reach; when the United States shall be a na- tion of 300,000,000 of free and independent peo- ple. And then our Congress will enact not alone what shall be done here but what shall be done elsewhere. And when that time is here, it will be time enough for free trade.

No; our protective policy is not as you call it "a stealing system." International condi- tions as they are to-day renders our protective system a safeguard to our development, and for the ultimate development of the human race.

What the proposition herein advocated aims to do is not to do away with protection, but to do away with its one-sidedness, as in operation in the United States. For at present the bur- dens rest too heavily on the agricultural in- terests, and which this proposition advocates shall be more equally distributed between agri- culture and manufacture.

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

In conclusion, Dr. Engel says:

The railway system of the United States, based on the monopoly of private companies, is without doubt the worst in the world, and more like a robber-cave than anything else.

Dr. Engel's arraignment of our railway system is entirely too severe. That there have been and that there are abuses there is no denying; but upon close observation Dr. Engel would no doubt also hear of complaints where the railroads are under government control. As the conditions are to-day but very few voters have any direct interest in shipping, but by the adoption of the proposition advocated every voter would indirectly become a shipper. This would tend to rectify many of the evils existing at the present time. We could then accomplish as many reforms as we could by government ownership of railways, and in addition escape the danger of increasing and centralizing the general government. For centralization leads towards bureaucracy, and this leads towards Russianism.

The cause that gives rise to much of the complaints against railroads may, as a general rule, be attributed to the great distances to the market centres, and the charge for that distance. This is the real cause why fruit sometimes has to rot in the orchards or be fed to hogs; why corn is sometimes used as fuel; why the farmer has often no profit, and the workman sometimes no work. All of which it is intended to remedy in the adoption of the proposition herein advocated.

Opinion of THE AMERICAN NEEDLE Co., East One Hundred and Sixteenth Street, New York:

The farmer gets the riches out of the earth, but, as a rule, after expenses and interest on mortgages are paid very little or nothing remains for himself. The government should certainly protect him against the pauper labor of China, India and Russia, and also protect him in preference to others in our own country who are not so worthy of it.

Opinion of ABRAHAM DARLINGTON, Placerville, Cal.:

You are wasting time and money. There can be no reform. The more merit any proposed plan may have, the more surely will it never be adopted. All economic wrongs exist because certain parties profit thereby and those parties control legislation and are able to prevent any material change.

It seems to me that Mr. Darlington is entirely too pessimistic. I think that it would be more in harmony with true experience to say: "The more merit any proposed plan may have the more surely will it be adopted." Not in a week, or month, or year, perhaps several years. Ultimately, however, the more meritorious must prevail over that which is less so.

Opinion of REDPATH BROS. MANUFACTURING Co., Boston, Mass.:

It would be a lasting benefit not only to the farmers, but the manufacturers as well. There is no doubt but that the farmer is the important individual of our country, as he is the great consumer of manufactured goods; and while he has

had to pay the tax upon imported goods to protect the manufacturer, he has had no protection, as the duty laid upon wheat and other products is only a "sop" thrown to the farmer by the protectionist, and of no benefit whatever.

Opinion of MR. BENJAMIN LEVY, manufacturer of perfumery, Boston, Mass.:

My opinion on this proposition is that it will not only benefit the farmers but also the laboring men, the manufacturers and business community at large, as the product from the soil is the foundation of wealth.

Opinion of D. VON DUERING, Napa, Cal.:

I am afraid that you are asking for too much, for the reason that it will take some time to educate the people and to make them understand the great benefits they would derive from it if your proposition became a law. But why not get a little less in the meantime, say an even rate on ten-pound packages to be delivered by mail? the same post packet delivery which is in practical use now in most all the States of Europe, and which proved an immense success. In that way eggs, butter, poultry, fruit, and all kinds of meat, in whatever shape, could thus be sent by mail at a uniform rate, and at a profit, both for producer and receiver.

By re-reading the first edition you will find that the above was advocated.

The present edition, by having the proposition divided into three classifications, makes the matter clearer. The above is under "Classification One." See pages 3 and 6.

Opinion of MR. F. DE GOMEZ, Valley View Farm, Auburn, Placer county, Cal.:

It should strongly appeal to the good judgment and sense of justice of every thinking American, be he farmer or laborer. And yet the proposition means such a decided departure from old established conditions, and at the same time such a radical adjustment of the inequalities and injustice existing in the present political management of commerce, that the very boldness of it seems to fill the average man with amazement; in some cases with downright indignation. People do not like to be startled. It is so very easy to dismiss a troublesome subject by calling it visionary or something less complimentary, and thus save a great expenditure of mental power—possibly, the exposure of a total lack of it. Let some of our editors wake up and throw off their mental lethargy. Your plan is worthy of all possible encouragement, and should be freely and intelligently discussed in its general tendencies and its detail of practical working, until the people are ready for its adoption and a realization of its far-reaching benefits.

Opinion of Mr. J. W. IRWIN, editor of the *Alliance Standard*, official organ of the Fourth Senatorial District, Linden, Texas:

As a step that will go a long way toward equalizing the distribution of wealth upon just principles, and bring about a state of higher civilization and consequent general prosperity. People are thinking, reading, investigating, as never before in the world's history, and out of it all will evolve a higher civilization, based upon justice and equity, or a universal upheaving of such mighty forces as will crumble nations and kingdoms into dust and ashes.

We see nothing impracticable in the proposition, but every sense of justice to that class who bear far more than their share of the burdens and receive nearly all kicks.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

tion of PROFESSOR RICHARD T. ELY, Ph.D., Principal of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.:

prepared to go a certain distance in the direction which you propose. For example, under government ownership, I would be willing to experiment with the zone system; and under government ownership, I should like to have postoffice business extended in such a way as to absorb the express business. In any case, all parcels of ten pounds or under are to be sent at one uniform rate of twelve cents. I am willing to go as far as that in this coun-

Professor Ely says at the start that he is prepared to go a certain distance in the direction which I propose, and then limits this direction by the specification as set forth above.

Let Professor Ely tell us why it is not satisfactory for the Government to own the railroads and steamships and run them on the zone system, before putting in operation a protective tariff!

Professor would probably answer, "It is necessary—because it isn't. Government ownership of sailing vessels and steamships and a protective tariff are two distinct and different questions."

Now, Classification Three is added as a supplement to the protective tariff, and calls for government reduction of rates on staple farm products, in the natural state, from seaports within the United States to foreign seaports. This classification, therefore, does not involve the use of a tariff at all.

He reasons in favor of the adoption of Classification Three have been already set forth in this pamphlet, it is not deemed necessary to repeat them here. Classification One is added to. There is therefore left for discussion Classification Two, and it may be pre-empted that Professor Ely intended that classification when he said: "I am prepared to go in the direction in the direction which you propose. For example, under government ownership, I would be willing to see experiments with the zone system." Now, while I object to have Classification Two called a zone system, I certainly do object to wait for government ownership of railroads before experiments are made in the direction indicated.

Should we wait?

Under government ownership of railroads is a possibility. Suppose we can never get all the way, therefore, never have Classification Two?

It has yet been refuted that 800,000 railroad employees would be (when tacked on to government service) a menace to a republican government?

It has shown how the necessary billions of dollars are to materialize in order to purchase the railroads.

These questions, and a dozen others of importance, are yet to be answered, and it is who can answer them properly. The question of railroad ownership and the adoption of Classification Two are not to be linked together at the present time. It will be time enough to do this when it has been ascertained that the transfer of the railways to the government is advisable and practicable.

Furtherance of the advocacy of Classification

Two, it becomes the duty of its advocates to show cause why it should be adopted, and to what has already been said on the subject elsewhere herein, I may add that the main reason why it is advocated is not so much because the saving that will be made by the producer of farm products on the lessened transportation charge, for that in itself will amount to very little. The great object is in the increased price that the product will bring, whether sold at home, or for the home market centers, or for export, which must follow with the reduction in the cost for transportation. This is the chief point, and will produce the great economic change so much desired. (See page 13.)

No, this question must not be tacked on to any other issue. It must stand or fall by itself. Arguments and reasons must be given that will convince. If such are not forthcoming, the whole matter should then be treated with contempt. If, on the other hand, the conclusion is reached that the law of distance, its natural tendency, and mode of rectification has been authenticated, then, in that event, it would be a manifest injustice to tack it on to an issue not yet elaborated.

Substantially, then, the law of distance, if left to work out its own results, as it has done in the rest of the world, will produce the same effects in our country that it has elsewhere.

If left to its own operation, there can only be but one result, and that is a gradual and constant reduction of the wage rate, hence a lowering of the state of civilization. There is no drawing here on the imagination. The law has been and is in operation, and will continue to be, unless arrested in its degenerating tendency.

This law has been more fully set forth in the article, "Distance as a Factor in Wages" (see pages 8 to 12), the rule of which I herewith repeat:

DISTANCE AS A FACTOR IN WAGES.

"Summing up, we may say that the continued increase of acreage of a field product at a remote distance from the market without a corresponding decrease of production of a like product in other sections, demands either a constant decrease of wages, or a gradual decrease in the cost of transportation; that wages may be maintained in remote sections if the transportation be correspondingly lowered, but if this is not the case, wages must decline."

This law must be refuted first before anyone may properly disregard it. If this law is correctly interpreted, is truly a law, then we cannot afford to ignore it. We cannot afford to wait. Our best interests may be served in prompt action. And it is a law. It may be seen in actual operation here in the West by anyone having the power to observe, and must continue to operate in the same direction until the cause is removed.

The following clippings from the San Francisco *Rural Press*, and from the Oroville *Register*, of recent date, will tend to corroborate what has been set forth:

FARM WAGES MUST COME DOWN.

It has been the pride of this State that wages were high and that workmen here were paid more than in any other State in the Union. Intelligent farmers who have studied the question

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

with much interest for several years past unite in saying that wages are too high in this State, and they must come down.

Then again we have:

The fruit-growers are even in a worse position than the grain-farmers, for fully one-half the expense of the present time comes from labor with which to pick, pack and handle their fruit.

Here we see plainly that it is not the Californian, but the "law of distance" that is doing the mischief.

We would like to increase rather than decrease wages, but this is impossible. We cannot meet and discuss this question and agree to pay only certain rates, for all the newspapers in the State would howl against us. Facts are, however, stubborn things, and we are forced to quit our lands, lease them, rent them or quit working them in order to avoid enormous losses.

Do you hear, you skilled Eastern workmen? The law of distance will soon convert the great customer for skilled labor goods into a customer for non-union sweater goods.

The question that stares the California farmer in the face is not the silver, or tariff, or any question now being discussed by Congress, but simply the one of high wages.

Certainly, and this pamphlet is intended to make it a subject not alone for thought and discussion, but of action as well.

Surely this is a subject for thought and discussion in view of the present era of low values for produce.

Here we may find the law governing value for field products and its relation to wages. Increased production on stationary cost for transportation must lower wages. The *Register* says:

It is a dismal question and one which excites the populace terribly, and yet it is merely an economic matter after all, which should be adjusted by calm calculation and full information of the facts.

Workmen in the East, you are to determine what kind of calm calculation will be in your best interests and the best interests of our country.

Shall the "law of distance" do its work?

Then is the wage rate doomed, and no tariff, union, strike, or demonstration, can have any permanent effect in maintaining it at its possible maximum. It will decline with the decline of your customer. "But," says some workman, "our customer is not only the field hand and the farmer. There are the city people." True, but whenever such a great portion of your customers begin to decline, this at once leaves you with an overstocked skilled labor market, and down comes wages.

Again, a reduction of 25 or 50 per cent. to the great army of farm hands, and a corresponding lessened net return to the farmer, will reduce the commercial and industrial value, not alone of those mentioned, but of all in the same section (if farming is the primary industry), and the storekeeper, the barber, the professor, the butcher, and even the bootblack, will all suffer in an even ratio with the farmer and farm hand. And, again, wages for skilled labor have to come down, and real estate with it in the great Eastern cities, and everything else. "Well," says the *laissez faire* man, "if wages come down because values decline, where is the harm?" The harm is in the supplanting of a higher by a lower form of civili-

zation. The introduction of a lower grade more servile labor in the West will enter the renting system into a permanent position. In the East the principal change there will be in the shifting of the demand for skilled labor to unskilled labor.

No, the *laissez faire* man is of no moral use to our country than would the itoline Venus be in St. Peter's. The time when there was some use for both time has gone. We cannot progress by the "let alone" policy. Ours is an action.

In closing the reply to Professor Ely, I not have anyone infer that he is a "let man. No; his opinion, as given above, that he belongs to the "action" school all friends of this movement hope, he that in the near future the Professor will only be willing to go "a certain distance the entire distance, provided, of course going is in the right direction.

Substantially, then, Classification Two supplement to the protective tariff system maintaining a maximum rate of wages will actually do what the tariff aims to cannot on account of the law of distance.

In the proposition under consideration workingman agrees to contribute a bread on condition of receiving a good loaf. And, for a wonder, Mr. Farmer case steps forward as the beneficiary.

Opinion of Mr. W. R. PATTEN, Glendale, Shasta County, Cal.:

A friend of mine handed me one of your pamphlets the other day and told me to read it and re-read it, and am still reading it, firmly believing that if it was made a law of the land it would bring quick relief to farm laborers, and those that need relief. No minded man can object to making your proposition a law of the nation.

I am a carpenter by trade, 56 years of age, a Republican ever since I knew of about Republicanism until the last two years ago I had a conviction that there was something rotten in Denmark, in the administration of the affairs of our country, and I investigated, by all means in my power on the Associated Press. At the end of one year, as a result of my investigations, I felt disgusted and indignant at both old political parties and in a proper state of mind to cast my lot with the Populists when they started in my country. Through them lies the only hope I can carry your proposition to a success. I will for it in my party.

Your proposition is double, but appears easily feasible. It is difficult to see why the Government could not transport a hundred weight, or a trainload of potatoes, for cost, as so much literature, be it trashy or wise.

Opinion of Mr. ELWOOD EASLEY, grower, Golden, Colorado:

By accident I received a copy of your proposition. I have read it very carefully and introduced it in our subordinate grange and Pomona grange, and it made quite an impression on many of the members of Pomona grange by a vote I was authorized to send for copies so they might better investigate it.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

ion of Wm. J. WARRENER, Professor of
lural Economics, Ohio University,
, Ohio:

whether all this is practical is another
together. One thing is certain. The pres-
itions are unjust and getting worse, and
another change. Socialism is the only
By socialism I mean national co-opera-
tion of competition, as now.

fess that I am not familiar with the
gs of socialism, and am therefore not
ent to give an opinion on the subject.

my belief, however, that building up
icultural interests, as herein proposed,
inly more practicable than national co-
on. How can you expect national co-
on as long as Europe is an "armed
as long as the greater portion of the
race are servile?

t kind of co-operation can there be be-
he people of this country and the peons
h America? The moujik, the coolie,
ah and the fellow—what kind of co-op-
could be had with these?

not far more practical to seek the wel-
our own republic, in order that it may
the greatest, wisest, strongest and
umane government in the world?

in this shall have been brought about, it
en be time enough to try national co-
on.

nunication of Mr. M. T. NOYES, mem-
the committee of five appointed by the
nia State Grange on this proposition:

STOCKTON, Dec. 6, 1893.

in, Esq.:

favor of November 25th at hand, and I
say that I think your last article much
and more feasible than the first. When
e them complete please send me a copy.
you are as much mistaken in regarding
free trader as I was when I took you for a
t. Perhaps I was a little too abrupt in
my opinion to Mr. Greer, for, to tell you
h, I am perfectly disgusted with the most
propositions advocated by the Populists,
the land loan scheme, the sub-treasury
the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, and
propositions quite as visionary. I think
all of the last elections have convinced the
hat we are not ready for free trade yet.
fully yours, M. T. NOYES.

ion of Mr. THOMAS WAND, Yost, Box
County, Utah:

proposition would do more to equalize the
s of the masses, and make it possible for
ducer to produce anything I have ever
say "to produce" from the fact that the
ion (in this locality, at least,) is reduced to
num. Why? Because any more than
enough for local consumption would be
ht of folly. Because, to transport the pro-
the market center would necessitate an
e on the product itself. In other words,
luct itself would only part pay the trans-
on, consequently how can production, in
ted or distant location, forge ahead under
circumstances? "Echo answers, how?"
seems to me that your proposition an-
solutely how. I would be pleased to re-
fozen of your pamphlets for distribution,
ld like to advance it as far as my humble
will admit.

HEADQUARTERS

PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY OF CALIFORNIA,
WATSONVILLE, CAL., Dec. 14, 1893.

MR. D. LUBIN, Sacramento, Cal.—Dear Sir:
Have just arrived home from the East, and feel
disappointed that I am unable to report any-
thing definite as to your transportation plan.

I presented a resolution, accompanied by your
letter to me, also the action of the Federated
Trades of Sacramento, and also one of your
pamphlets to the National Grange, and had it re-
ferred to the Committee on Transportation. Ow-
ing to a serious illness, necessitating my absence
at the last half of the meeting, I do not know the
fate of the resolution, but expect soon to receive
the necessary information from the National
Secretary. I asked for a fair and impartial exam-
ination of the merits of your "plan."

Regretting the delay, I am yours, respectfully,
A. P. ROACHE.

I do not feel disappointed at all. How could
it be expected that Delegate Roache could find
endorsement for a proposition which he prob-
ably does not yet fully understand, and which
he was too sick to present anyway, when I,
who have tried to master this great problem
during these past nine years, and was not
sick, but spoke with as much earnestness as I
am possessed of before the convention of the
American Federation of Labor at Chicago, and
was, besides ably assisted in my efforts by the
Pacific Coast delegation and other noted labor
leaders. Yet all I could obtain was a resolution
that the labor unions would read and discuss
this proposition during the year.

Mr. Roache can rest assured that if there is
merit in the proposition, the time will come
when not alone will labor unions pass resolu-
tions in its favor, but that the National Grange
will, too. Yes, they will not alone pass resolu-
tions, but they will do more than that—they
will act.

Opinion of Dr. S. S. STOHL, Drury College,
Springfield, Mo.:

As a son of a farmer, I heartily endorse your
views in a "A Novel Proposition," sent me some
time ago. As the farmer is benefited, in the same
degree is the material welfare of this great com-
wealth strengthened.

In conclusion, Mr. Stohl says:

I wish to prepare an oration on this subject;
will you please write me where I can obtain fur-
ther information along this line?

Yes, friend Stohl, make up your mind to
convert twenty men to this proposition, then
select the fish-head and hog-belly kind; work
away until you convince them, and you will
not only be able to prepare an "oration," but
you will be an oration yourself.

Try it. If there is anything in you it will
come out in this way, sure.

Opinion of Mr. J. B. OLINGER, Sanger,
Fresno county, Cal.:

It would come nearer meeting the wants of the
producing and laboring classes than any other
proposition that has ever come under my ob-
servation. I have done considerable reading
and thinking during the past ten years on this
subject, and I am thoroughly convinced that re-
lief we must have, and to obtain it, as you say,
we must agitate, educate and organize, and com-
pel the two great parties to indorse a plan for our
relief or organize a national party of our own.

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

Opinion of Professor GEO. M. FORBES, Ph. D., professor of History of Philosophy and Logic, Rochester, N. Y., Jan. 20, 1894:

On the whole the plan strikes me favorably, or at least I think I can see some advantages which would result from giving all producers virtually equal access to all markets. At the same time I can see very decided disadvantages, one being that the natural conditions of production are so varied in different sections, that without the protection of transportation many local producers would be driven from the market.

As for the "very decided disadvantages"—where are they? Certainly not in the direction nor for the cause indicated. Let us take London as an illustration: It is centrally located, among the most advanced and thickly settled countries of Europe, and being a free port the products pour into that city from all quarters. There the competition is the most keen in the world, and yet, and for all that, a ten-acre tract of fair, tillable land, within reasonable distance from London, is far more valuable than it would be with London half or third the size.

Should objections be made to the increased value of the land on the score that its higher value would only lessen the net return, the answer is, for a like quality of product—yes. The question remains, are the qualities of near-by and remote sections alike? Not where land is high by reason of close proximity to a great market center. Here the law of location and its relative value operates as within the city.

A capital of \$300 is not enough for a millinery establishment in a location where the rent is \$5,000 a year. It may be ample for a location at \$20 a month.

Now, why does not the lower rent-payer drive the higher rent-payer out of business? Simply because the higher rent-payer possesses an advantage in a much higher technical knowledge, and which is further fostered by close proximity with those who demand this higher technical knowledge.

Now apply the same law to farming values. When the far-away farmer raises strawberries and radishes, the near farmer generally cultivates a certain strawberry, or a certain radish (provided there is population and wealth concentrated enough to demand it). The far-away farmer's product may bring five cents a pound, the near-by twenty-five cents a pound, and yet both may have as a remainder an equal ratio of net return.

As classification three (the small package transportation) is in operation in the principal countries in Europe, and as this has had no effect whatever in reducing the net return to farms near London, we can therefore conclude that the only adjustment necessary is the acquirement of a higher technical knowledge by farmers near the increasing market centers.

Further on, Professor Forbes says:

Generally speaking, I think it would make little difference to the consumer. Hence he would view the scheme with indifference.

That depends. A foreigner residing temporarily in our country, a soldier in the regular army, a sailor, or a man in prison for life, would, perhaps, view the scheme with indifference. Just as soon, however, as the great army of wage-earners in the United States will begin to realize the importance and bearing of this

proposition on the demand for labor of wages, and the hours for work, they view the scheme with indifference. Contrary, they will become the no workers, and these, when allied (on ti with the farmers, would bring victory.

Besides these, there are the manu and merchants. Is the former not fo creased orders, and the latter of increa

Further on, Professor Forbes says:

It is not claimed, as I understand would diminish at all the cost of transp It simply proposes a redistribution of its

"It simply proposes a redistributi burdens," is correct, as far as the me transportation is concerned. When done there is an effect that follows eq portant, and that is the home price equally with the advanced quotation port or for the home market center.

LAISSEZ FAIRE.

There is, of course, that school of e which teaches the "let alone" policy school this proposition will have but chance to even get a hearing. There ever, one consolation, and that is th faire" school of economics is not a factor in this age or country. engineer is to a machinery hall the be the political economist in social ical science. As the engineer has at hand the oil can and wrench, his c seems to be to observe, and appl to reduce friction, and the wrench i or loosen. The political economist, with the wrench of conservatism, c false innovation, and with the oil of removes friction, for when burdens a or impolitic, and the injustice or impo nre is permitted to persist, not onl evil result work out its issue along tl bounds of its own course, but det results will permeate, radiate, and ref rections obscure to the ordinary obs tends always toward loss, pain and sion. On the other hand, burdens borne, when redistributed in the line and good policy—and the change is a as in the former case, only here it direction of gain, pleasure, and prog which persists onward from its prin in courses so varied and labyrinthian the skill of the most ingenious and mind to trace.

Further on, Professor Forbes says:

It is a serious question whether ti proposed would secure better econon than the present method. I am inclin it might, and certainly would like to periment in the direction proposed.

EDGEWOOD (near Auburn),
November 10,

DAVID LUBIN, Esq., Sacramento—
The people of this district are very mu ted in your pamphlet. We held a publ at our school house last night which w tended, and the inclosed resolution wa Those who had your pamphlet gave i to read, but if you can send a copy to ti names I have given on the inclosed y will greatly oblige.

Yours truly,
F. M. 1

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

n of Mr. Geo. S. JEFFERY, Grainland, Inty, California:

oppose a step in the right direction. I may maintain your ideas in print a time to enable an anxious people to see stages of your scheme over the movements that may be circulated to coun-

e, friend Jeffery, that I have, and now chance to do a "turn" for Uncle Sam. uing, Mr. Jeffery says:

m products of our country are obliged te with like products produced by the labor in the world. In justice to the , should have the privilege of purchas- if revenue for any purpose, his necessa- ing implements of every description, cts of the soil and manufactured arti- uced and created by the cheapest labor orld. No advantages has ever been he farmer to offset the price he pays to protection for manufactures.

clusion, Mr. Jeffery says:

Grangers' and Farmers' Alliances ut the country could be prevailed upon a your scheme and forward resolutions o their representatives in Congress, per- ould do great good.

proposition has merit, it will receive reement of all representative organ-

n of HERBERT FOWLER (farmer), Lin- .:

it it was hard to get people to pay any to your pamphlet, but now it seems to rybody's tongue. One week ago to-day i of your pamphlets and started out to day with a certain lot of my neighbors n't see very often. Well, sir, the very I hopped onto was an old Yankee who e to be nominated for Supervisor at the ention held in this county, and a pretty man to. But he said the thing wouldn't d I started in to convince him that it took the proposition up section by section and stayed with him until after 4 ad then gave it up as a bad job. But told a friend of mine that it was the best ver read or heard of and was just what rs wanted.

n of Mr. C. E. ROSS, Pueblo, Colorado: ur proposition would appear on its face istic idea and scheme, however, after your pamphlet, and taking everything sideration, I, as a life-long Republican, ving in protection first, last and all ve come to the conclusion that in the ur plan is feasible and would work a ot only to the farmer but to all classes itions.

n of Mr. I. J. ABRAHAM, Lake View,

is another reason why your "Novel on" should be carried out. Farmers cross their stock. They can afford to animal, but the freight comes to more cost, so they decline. I have read many o how the British government in her inds the railroad companies to haul y long distances to the sea coast at a price, so as to make grain raising pay r far inland.

Opinion of Mr. HENRY DeGROOT, Jr., Medford, Oregon:

The principal reason for indorsing this plan is that it will, in a great measure, relieve our nation of that great curse of civilization, the centralization of population. For many years we have been crying for immigration. "Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm." They have come; they have examined the situation, and they have flocked back to the cities with the unanimous and truthful report that the farm is so remote from market that the produce would not pay for transportation.

Place these remote lands on an equal footing with others, so far as the cost of getting to market is concerned, and I will be one of many millions ready to strike out into the wilderness to locate a homestead.

Opinion of Mr. THOMAS J. SPARKS, Contolene, Butte county, Cal.:

It solves a problem in political economy that I have been studying for years. I have been a constant reader of many of the reform papers published in the United States, and there is not a proposition in any of them that is as near the mark as this.

Opinion of Mr. D. J. NEILL, Prescott, Arkansas:

Your proposition is a new and novel idea. Any plan that would put the product of the farm at the door of the markets cheaply as you propose would revolutionize farming, and redound greatly to the advantage of both the producer and consumer, stimulate commerce, and make door neighbors of both farm and markets.

Opinion of Mr. W. F. GILLIHAN, St. Helena, Cal.:

All things come to those who wait. Protection, by your proposition, will protect. Now it is groping in the dark. Take what you can get and look happy. Your plan, if made a law, will be a public benefit.

Opinion of Mrs. M. M. STUART, Auburn, Cal.:

The pamphlet and clippings duly received. I thank you. Although a woman, I am much interested in the proposition you advance.

I see no reason why women should not take as much interest in the proposition as men.

Opinion of Mr. C. E. ROBERTS, Elmira, Cal.:

Would not a low uniform rate of shipment where grain could be shipped to New York as cheap as San Francisco, virtually cut off San Francisco from most of its trade as a shipping point, thereby creating a great expense in railroad freight.

No, it would do nothing of the kind. Grain and staple farm products would come under Specification Three of this proposition, for which please see pages 3 and 7, and you will see that staples are not to go by rail at all, but from seaports in the United States to foreign seaports.

In conclusion, Mr. Roberts says:

I am not a protectionist, but if the plan will offset the other evil, we will welcome it.

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

Opinion of WILLIAM H. MACE, A.M., Professor of History and Political Science, Syracuse University, New York, January 29, 1894:

I feel to some extent the unequal load the farmer carries. Here is a difficulty; your plan would distribute more equally the profits of farmers among farmers. This would be favored by those whose profits are small, but opposed by those who profit by location.

Permit me to differ with you, Professor. My plan does not propose to distribute the profits of farmers among farmers, at least not as interpreted by you.

The farmer who now profits by location, will (by the adoption of the proposition) profit all the more. The greater development of the south and west will result in a corresponding industrial development in the market center to which the small farm is adjacent.

If small farms adjacent to market centers made large profits by raising a, b, and c, and the far away sections were also to raise a, b, and c, and of the same quality, and be permitted to reach the more profitable market at a nominal rate, they would certainly interfere with the near by farmer.

Should we find, however, that the remote farmer in the west, is more advantaged by raising d, e, and f., and of the south g, h, and i., the result must prove beneficial, not alone to the remote farmer in being able to realize a profit, by reason of the advantage the adoption of the proposition would give him, but a corresponding advantage must accrue to the near by farmer, by reason of the greater prosperity of the market center to which his farm is adjacent, caused by the greater prosperity of the west and south. And this is just what we would find.

Further on, Professor Mace says:

The redistribution of population, which you hold to offset this, would be so slow as to offer no inducement to persons injured by the change. But, no doubt, this objection you have already met, and I may find it removed upon close study of your pamphlet.

If we admit what has been stated in the illustration above, we must conclude that the injury by the change is not likely to occur. On the other hand, the continued increase of product in the west and south, without a corresponding decrease in cost for transportation, must reduce the net income of the farmer in the west and south, and above all the wage rate in every section. When this takes place, the lessened orders for skilled labor goods to the market centers adjacent to the small farm must reduce its income, hence its value.

In conclusion, Professor Mace says:

'One great good will come from the clash of opinion your proposition provokes; a deeper knowledge of the wants of the agricultural interests of America.'

Opinion of the REV. WILLIAM HAMILTON, Pastor Allen Memorial M. E. Church, New York.

The proposition seems to me to be practical, and, if so, would without doubt be the greatest blessing that could come to our farmers. I was especially struck by one of your questions: "Why do farmers forsake their farms, and why do they

and their sons flock to the city?" The force of the question is tremendous. They do not come because they love brick and mortar, but because they know there is no profit in farming. It seems that by the adoption of this proposition the would not be thronged with so many thousands of unemployed, if it were known that there was profit in farming. This congested mass of humanity, ill housed and fed, would turn their attention to a more healthy and remunerative occupation. That Agriculture is the very corner-stone of national prosperity, there can be no question. What benefits the farmer benefits all.

NIPOMA, San Luis Obispo Co., Cal.
October 12, 1894

MR. DAVID LUBIN, Sacramento, Cal.—
SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Nipoma, having come in possession of a copy of your pamphlet entitled "A Novel Proposition," and with much interest, and indorsing the sentiment therein, and we believe a large number of people of this neighborhood would indorse principles that you have presented, we enclose about thirty copies for distribution. Please address same to H. C. Fry, Nipoma, Cal.

Yours most respectfully,

L. WOOD,
TILL DAGG,
H. MITCHELL,
H. C. FRY,
E. C. LOOMIS

Opinion of A. W. ARNOLD, San de Washington:

My opinion on this proposition is that it is answerable.

It will be another emancipation proclamation more potent to the producing population was that which freed the slaves of the South.

Your proposition is doing its work in being read, and I hear of no unfavorable comment by those who have read it.

MR. HELLEMS, editor of the Kingsville view, of Kingsville, Ontario, says:

That there is no good reason why it is not practicable. It would undoubtedly benefit all classes inasmuch as whatever benefits the farmer fits the mechanic and manufacturer. If farmers were made more remunerative, the professional and mechanical ranks would not be overworked.

Opinion of E. C. DREW, Postmaster, Ar La.:

I think that the discussion of the matter evolve from the minds who make it a study plan that will prove feasible and inexpensive. If you succeed in doing this, you will have accomplished a great work.

Opinion of MR. G. G. GILBERT, Cornishama county, Cal.:

Without some such protection for the farmer I think you give the best argument for general universal free trade that I have ever read. Give the farmer the relief proposed, and you have dealt free trade its death blow.

Opinion of D. M. SMITH, Rock Ridge ard, Newcastle, Cal.:

I may assure you of my pleasure and appreciation of your efforts to benefit our country.

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

on of P. N. LATHROP, Salada, Oregon:
the first and only move in the right di-
for the protection of farmers I have ever
d I heartily concur in it.

on of Mr. FRANK SWEENEY, Elmira,
ia:
t will in every way prove beneficial to
er, laborer, merchant and manufacturer,
d out.

on of Mr. MILTON A. SMITH, Annister,
ia:
very novel, I think it entirely practical.

EW C. RYCE, Fresno Co., Cal.: "As a
and as a Republican I would rejoice to
proposition put in force."

ME. J. C. KENNEDY, of Winters, Yolo Co.,
and ~~Mrs. George~~ WALTER STEVENS, of San
Jose, Santa Clara Co., Cal., have been among
the most enthusiastic advocates in their re-
spective sections.

GEO. HODGES, Salada, Oregon: "Read pam-
phlet, and passed it to my neighbors until it is
worn out. Have only found one man who
was opposed, and he does not pay taxes or
produce anything."

THE WRITER OF THIS PAMPHLET has received
several hundred marked copies of newspapers
from the various sections of the Union, con-
taining criticisms and opinions. The space of
this issue does not permit any extended review
of these. The next issue will be for opinions
and criticisms of farmers and newspapers.

FREE TRADE AND THE AMERICAN WORKINGMAN.

ay be safely assumed that a working-
ceiving \$12 per week, and which he uses
port of himself and family (wife and
children), uses up about \$7 50 of the \$12
of food and rent.

what saving could this workman effect
free trade in the \$7 50 so spent?

little, if any; certainly none on the
food products, for these are now sold at
r price in their natural state in the
States than in Europe.

at, for instance, is 20 cents a bushel
r in California than in Liverpool—that
never the cost of freight to Liverpool is
s per bushel.

ent would remain about the same, nor
there be any perceptible change or low-
n the price of staple domestic clothing
ishing, for these are almost as low here
any part of the world; nor on coal or
ne oil, for these, as a rule, are manipu-
y combines.

nay, however, admit that, on the whole,
y effect a saving of 10 per cent. on the
n other words, that \$10 80 will under
ade buy as much as \$12 does now. The
an and his family would, therefore, be
l off with a wage rate of \$10 80 under
ade as with \$12 now.

question now remains: Will he under
ade receive \$10 80 per week? Let us see.
normal wage rate for factory work people
tria is from fifty kreutzers to one gulden
y. (A gulden is 40 cents.)

freight charges from European seaports
w York on general manufactures range
e way from a few mills to 5 per cent. on
llar.

, under free trade there would be nothing
vent the Austrian manufactures from
ng New York, unless it would be that
merican workman could produce the
manufactures at a lower price. Let
that the American merchants would
im the preference at the same price (the
ian price). We would thus find that by
ade the American workman would have
ost of his living reduced from \$12 to
per week, but he would only receive
n wages per week to meet the \$10 80 ex-

penditure. Now, then, what would he be com-
pelled to do in order to live? The following:
1st—His wife and children would be obliged to
go to work in place of attending to the house
or going to school. 2d—Move into cheaper
quarters. 3d—Consume less of the average
and more of the lower grade food and cloth-
ing. 4th—Newspapers (except an anarchistic
one) and church expenses would be eliminated.
With all this change would come a still greater
change, for the erstwhile self-respecting Amer-
ican family will have changed into the Aus-
trian "dienstman" and "dienstfrau," and his
children would be "lumpen," and, to cap the
climax, it will only be necessary to fill him up
with cheap "rot-gut," and the whole brood
will be ready for any demonstration that
whim, influence and passion may exert.

But what need is there for this degeneracy?
Can we not avoid it by the protective tariff?

Is not the tariff in operation now?

Is it not effectually preventing the "degen-
eracy" you speak of? If it is, what is the good
of setting up an imaginary "degeneracy"
condition that does not and is not likely to
exist?

"Yes, protection is an advantage. We admit
it. It is in operation, and so here is an end to
the matter."

"End of what matter?"

"Of the debate on it."

"Why shall there be an end?"

"Because it has been settled to the satisfac-
tion of everybody."

"You are wrong! I am not satisfied."

"Who, sir, are you?"

OBJECTION BY THE PRODUCER OF STAPLES.

"I am the producer of staple farm products,
and I want you to understand that I represent
an industry fully as important, and much
more so than manufactures. Yes, you, sir,
fixed it all right, to your entire satisfaction.
The American workingman must of course
have a stovepipe hat, and his wife a Spring
bonnet, and their darling baby boy a Lord
Fauntleroy suit, and his sweet little girlies a
combination suit. They must go to the mat-
inee, and attend dancing school and be respect-
able. Now, what on earth are you thinking
about? Where do I come in? Here you admit

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

that the workman, who is only worth in the world's labor market \$2 40 per week, receives \$12 per week. Now, where does the \$9 60 come from?"

"Well, we all pay a little of it."

"Who are the 'we'?"

"The manufacturers, merchants, professional men, the farmers."

"No, but they do not, not a single penny. It is only they who are compelled to sell their products at the world's (free trade) prices, and pay for labor and necessities at protection prices, who pay the difference between the \$2 40 and the \$12 a week. As a producer of staple products, I do this. Now, why should I do it?"

"Of what benefit is it to me or my industry to foster and pamper a lot of people at my expense? Would they be willing to tax themselves for my benefit even to the extent of a dollar a week? No, indeed; their talkers and workers would shout themselves hoarse in denouncing and villifying us, but nary a dollar would they tax themselves for our relief. Why should my industry, then, be called upon to tax itself with paying \$9 60 for every \$12 they receive in wages?"

"Just see what it does—this unnatural high pampering. It attracts to our shores the human scum of all the continents, and no sooner are they here and gorge to the full with our, yes, with my food and drink, and when they begin to wash up and resemble men, than they begin to curse our institutions, and laugh at us for being fools enough to pamper them. No, sir, I am done with this state of affairs. Free trade is good enough for me."

"Well, why don't you get it?"

"Ah! that's just where the shoe pinches. We producers of staples appear to be outnumbered, but the time may come when we may win."

When will you win? Will it be when the workmen will not number so many voters, when you know they are increasing so much more rapidly than the voters of your industry? Or are you waiting for the time when workmen will get tired of receiving \$12, and hanker, instead, after the \$2 40 per week?

Come, Mr. Staple Farm Product Producer, look the matter squarely in the face. You can't have free trade, no matter how badly you want it. No, not as long as the Government of the United States remains the same as it is to-day.

Now, the sooner you realize this as a fact the more common sense will you display. And above all, don't deceive yourself with the "tariff reform" humbug, for it will cost you infinitely more effort than the results justify. Just you stay where you are, and like a true philosopher make the best of it.

"I suppose I will have to."

Yes, and it is well that you have to. You drew one picture and gave your side of the story. There is another side. Do you wish to hear it?

"Well, yes, go ahead."

ANOTHER SIDE TO THE STORY.

We must all recognize the fact that there is a sovereignty inherent in nations, and which is exercised by the governing power. In our

country the majority rule, and if protected by the will of the majority, it becomes and has as much virtue by reason of its merit as a law as any other law equally by the will of the people, or by their representatives. Nor is it a fact that all law has its root in ethics, or what we sometimes term abstract right. Mere utility in favor of those who have the power of representation, is sufficient.

Now, while this may seem contrary to the rules of action according to the highest standard, it yet may unknowingly and almost acceptably lead right on towards the development.

Without protection we would have insignificant power. Our republicanism would ere this have been forced into the hands of the powers whose existence depends on the annihilation of individual and national liberty. We have happily survived the embryonic state, but we are not "out of the woods" yet. For what one nation can do longer, do a combination of nations can do longer.

Our chief good fortune, therefore, is that through protection we have become mighty for destruction by any one power, however formidable; and happy mutual jealousies of the monarchical has prevented any attempt at a concerted movement. In the meantime we are here, making hay while the sun shines, adding to our numbers by immigration you make a mistake when you join in the shallow-brained professional and imbibe their distorted ideas on the question of immigration. They object to the anarchists and nihilists coming here, and wish to stop immigration. What kind of migration? First class, second class, or emigrant? Clearly immigrant. Well, doctors of anarchism, such as Prince Kropotkin and others, travel in the steerage?

Ask any policeman of experience will tell you of a hundred different ways a nihilist or an anarchist may land in spite of any law against it.

Is it not Siberia or death for those found in Russia? Are there not a goodly plenty there at all seasons?

As for the "scum," there is no more now than there has been in the past. The public school acts as powerfully on the Armenian or Italian child as it does on the English or Irish child. As for the "old folks," six of one and a half dozen of the other is the children we want and not the old folks, for, as a rule, the old folks would long enough to do much harm any way.

When we consider these, we must all be in mind that the life of a nation and that of an immigrant are far apart. Besides, I infinitely more prefer that the immigrants possess some spirit, public spirit, even if it is made manifest in unruly agitator demonstrations at times, than to get a cowardly submission as to show no cause for public criticism. The former may grow into a power for the conservation of the latter are a snare and a weakness to the public. Of what use would several Chinamen or Hindoos be to us in a time of international troubles? The very agitators

(Address D. LUBIN, SACRAMENTO, CAL.) (Copies of this pamphlet free.)

onstrations of these immigrants no doubt
s a useful economic purpose which may
s discerned on the surface. The objection
these immigrants take the bread out of
mouths of natives; that they lower wages,
seemingly true, is nevertheless false.
high wage rate by the world's standard
not exist. It comes, as you truly said,
f the pockets of the producers of staples.
the more there is to divide, the less, of
e, there is to the man. But the scheme
e Great Designer, as I understand it, was
so much to provide a country of high
s to workmen as much as it was (and
establish a mighty nation for the estab-
ment of that exalted universal develop-
of the human race in harmony with the
e plan.

hile much that you have said appears to
bear an element of truth within it, there
vertheless, a fatal flaw to it all."

IS THERE A FLAW?

hat is that flaw?" It is this: "The
l's price of my product has been con-
ly declining, and the time has about come
it is impossible for my industry to exist
r the conditions that it has in the past.
should the present low prices, or even
r prices, prevail, I and my fellows will be
n from the land, and absentees landlord-
and the renter will take our place. Who
then buy the goods that this vast army of
ers stand ready to make; must make in
r to live?"

es, I have had that very thing in mind,
only wanted a chance to lead up to it; you
however, done so. The time has truly
when there must be a shifting of the
en, and to a degree which will eliminate
danger which threatens both interests.
that shifting is in protecting agriculture
ell as manufacture."

What will be gained by that? If my indus-
s to receive back what is taken from it,
not have free trade?" "Because, as was
d before, YOU CANNOT HAVE IT, FOR YOU
A MAJORITY; AND IF YOU COULD HAVE IT,
OULD NOT BE FOR YOUR ULTIMATE GOOD, NOR
THE ULTIMATE GOOD OF OUR COUNTRY."
ou surely seem to me to speak in riddles.
ve followed you closely, and right down to
I could comprehend you, but now I can-

will explain: Free trade would at this
ture degenerate, and perhaps tend to de-
our country. So likewise would our pres-
system of protection, and that chiefly by
on of the world's prices that now rule, and
likely to rule for your product. There is,
efore, a middle course, and that middle
se is, as I said before, to protect your in-
ry, but not to such an extent as to take
all the support that your industry now
s to the others, but only to a degree."
Vell, can that not be done by tariff re-
m?" "No; and you ought to know it by
time. Tariff reform may be a good cry for
e who wish to get into power, but it can do
but little practical good, and as a rule will
bor much harm. There is, of course, merit
riff adjustment to a degree of interest to
workers, but when it means a direct com-

petition with German, Austrian, French, or
English labor, it does you no good, and to a de-
gree does the harm that free trade would do to
manufacture."

"What then is your plan?"

EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSITION.

It is that the government pay out a portion
of the money that it receives as duty by reason
of the protective tariff on the cost for trans-
portation of the products of your industry in
its natural state. This will advance the selling
price of your product not alone on what is ex-
ported, but for all of that greater portion which
you sell at home. (See pages 13, 14 and 15.)

"Will not the other nations do the same
thing if we do? And if they do, how will we
gain thereby?"

"They cannot, for they are not in a position
to do it. The expense would be too great a
strain for them. But even if they did, it
would do us no harm, for the only effect that a
lowering of cost for transportation can pro-
duce is to advance the price."

"Suppose the foreign shipowners advance
the price for shipping, what then?"

"There is nothing to prevent them doing
that now, is there? There will be less chance
when the entire nation will have a say in the
matter."

"What results may be expected to follow by
the adoption of this plan?"

"The results likely to follow are these: First,
a great expansion in the area of lands under
cultivation and a corresponding activity in
manufacture. In fact, a great development of
all sections of our country, a vigorous activity
in every branch of industry."

"But will not this expansion in agriculture
lower the world's market price again?"

"No, for we are not the only factor in pro-
duction. The world cannot afford to lower its
price just to spite us, besides the increased
acreage will find an increased army of home
consumers by reason of the increased indus-
trial activity."

"It seems to me that this reform would be
in the direction of a redistribution of wealth,
would it not?"

"Yes."

"That is, you propose to take from the
pockets of those who now help themselves out
of my pocket a share of that which they have
taken and give it back to me."

"Yes."

"Against the will or consent of the original
takers?"

"With their will and consent."

"Have you not counted without your host?
Do you think that they would ever consent to
anything of the kind? I don't."

"Well, here is where I differ with you. I
admit that at the start they will view the
matter with indifference; and, as soon as your
industry shall have taken up the proposition
in earnest, they may, perhaps, at the start,
view it with suspicion and alarm. It will then
be your duty to inform them why this redi-
stribution shall take place. You could then
frankly tell them that, unless there are means
enough left in your pocket to buy goods and
pay ruling wages for hired help, that you will
have to stop buying goods to the extent you

(Opinions and clippings, for comment and publication in the next issue, solicited.)

formerly did, and thereby lower, not alone the wage rate of your hands directly, but of skilled labor indirectly. In other words, unless they come to your assistance, you will be forced to withdraw orders for skilled-labor goods, hence leave them short of work. And the same will happen when the great army of field hands have their wages reduced; which, when all this shall have been done, must reduce the demand for skilled labor; and thus the very intention of the protective tariff will be nullified, and even any advantage we could gain by free trade would be swallowed up."

"But, my dear sir, why all this 'rig-marole'? Why not free trade? My industry would then have the great load lifted from its shoulders once and for all; the prosperity of my industry would then furnish the means to keep the factories a-humming."

"I told you before that you cannot have free trade because the majority will not let you have it, and you should not have it because it would not be in the best interest of this country for you to have it. Free trade will not keep our factories 'a-humming,' but it will keep the German, Swiss, Belgian, French, Austrian and English shops 'a-humming,' or else our wage rate will have to decline to their level."

"It seems to me that you have overlooked an important factor, and that is the superiority of the American workman and the aid they derive through American inventive genius. With these we ought to beat the world."

THE SUPERIORITY OF THE AMERICAN WORKMAN.

"No, I have not overlooked these advantages at all, and I agree with you that these are a factor, and a powerful one, too; but the cause of this superiority has its root in the high wage rate. Remove the cause, the high wage rate, and the skill and genius goes with it."

"But, if the skill and genius is here, and we can produce more than the European, for a given amount anyway, why do we fear the European competition?"

We are obliged to fear it, because our skill and inventive genius, in itself, is not enough to meet the low wage rate of Europe. Our inventions, though they serve us for a season, are presently copied by the Europeans, and our advantage is gone until we improve on that again. To sum up: our high wage rate, which the protective tariff makes possible, only serves us to just keep ahead of the Europeans. Now the longer we continue on this plane the more expert will we become, and this, of course, helps to decrease your burden on account of decreased cost, not for wages, but for production. Replace the American wage by the European rate, and the skill and genius will be no higher than in Europe."

"If you are right, then in that event my industry is not suffering through the protective tariff at all! For it would appear that notwithstanding the high wage rate our workmen are so much more skilled, and are so much aided by our inventive genius, that this would cover the difference."

"No; you have stated the matter too broadly. Our workmen, as was said before, just manage to keep ahead, and when the European evens

up, our men forge ahead again. You must serve that there are quite a quantity of American machines, implements, and devices exported to Europe every year. This would you to suppose that we are exporters of American manufactures, but do not deceive yourself. These are most generally exported to serve as models to copy from, which done, takes our advantage in superiority from us."

"Now to return to the workmen. I really think they would consent to the amendment you propose, and permit us to put our proposition into operation?"

WOULD THEY CONSENT?

"As I said before, I think they would, in fact, I am sure they would, and for these reasons: First, the very slight advance in staples would be more than counterbalanced by the steady demand for labor. From a practical point of view, the case may be illustrated thus: A few years ago, when cotton and wheat were much higher than now, work was plentiful. Now wheat and cotton are low and to be sure, and work is scarce, and wages demoralized. Even with the low price of wheat is the 5 or 10 cent loaf any larger than when wheat was high? Supposing it was (which is not) would a penny's worth more bread compensate for a demoralized labor market? Not even a premium of five loaves a day would not compensate it, and yet you would be asking for a mere trifle, which the workmen would not dare to refuse, because to do so would hurt him in just as vital a spot as you would you, for what to you is solvency? To him it is a steady demand for labor. Without that demand he becomes a wanderer and a tramp, and his union melts like snow near a fire. A steady demand for labor, he is an honorable citizen, the right arm of the law, and his organizations become a powerful action, and a ready lever in his hand to shape his needs."

"Well, how will the manufacturing and commercial people receive this proposition?"

"Favorably; for to begin with it will cost them many more millions of dollars than it would cost them. Take the one item of cotton, for example. In the last four years, when there is to be a change in administration, especially when radical changes are to be made, the loss in value of cotton is enormous, and failures and bankruptcies are almost the rule. The adoption of this proposition would neutralize the depressive tendency of these occurrences to a certain degree, if it would not remove it altogether. No, the merchant and manufacturer would stand in the way."

"How can it be done?"

"There is only one way, and that way is hard work."

"Who shall do this hard work?"

"Primarily, those whose interests it will serve directly, but as it is intended to serve the best interests of the nation, all should aid."

Farmers of the United States, there is much for you to do. Workingmen of the United States, stand in and help the cause, and help to create and maintain a steady demand for labor.

PRESS OPINIONS.

ly Leader, Lemoore, Cal., October 21st: "Is a good deal of merit in the proposition and its effects and bearing would be and more far-reaching in their operation appears at first sight."

ally Statesman, Walla Walla, Wash., 18th: "It is a novel proposition, indeed well worth consideration."

ngburg Independent, Indiana, October: "It would no doubt materially agriculturists."

Road, Denver, Colo., October 21st: "The adoption of such a plan would to the benefit of the agricultural and g classes there is no question."

Blaine Journal, Blaine, Wash., October: "Should pronounce it a good idea ical."

ern Watchman, Eureka, Cal., October: "It is evidently a careful study of the

che Illinois Staats Zeitung, Chicago, December 19, 1893: "At the convention American Federation of Labor this on, the Lubin proposition was again ed. The McGlynn motion to have bor organization in the United States and consider the same was carried."

ado Daily Chieftain, Colorado City, October 18th: "The pamphlet should be hands of every wage worker and ; it is a grand educator."

nan's National Farmer and Turfman, Wash., October 20th: "In this age ressive thought, it is well for the peo the nation to broaden their minds by ; such works."

Sultan City Journal, Sultan City, October 21st: "Each objection is und admirably answered. The little ould be in the hands of every think- er in the land."

Daily Optic, East Las Vegas, New , October 24th: "The scheme is novel; er else may be said of it."

Star-Independent, Harrisburg, Pa., r 24th: "There is that which is utopian proposition."

aul Despatch, St. Paul, Minn., Octo- h: "The subject is of interest alike agriculturist, the manufacturer, the igned in commerce, and the laborer."

ersity Herald, Ada, Ohio, October 27th: proposition is profound and far-reach- its results. Let us have it discussed."

southern Cultivator, Atlanta, Ga., No- r: "The proper equalization of the seems to us to be more just and equit- the body politic."

Nord California Herald, Sacr- cember 23, 1893: "Our fellow-citizen, D. Lubin, spok at the convention of the American Fed- eration of Labor, Chicago, explaining his proposition. His plan received a great deal of attention and approval."

The Tacomian, Tacoma, Wash., October 28th: "At first glance, the proposition ap- pears an absurdity; but it is not to be consid- ered by itself as an independent measure, but in connection with the protective tariff sys- tem."

Brewster News, Nebraska, October 27th: "The general outline of the plan is in accord with the trend of public sentiment."

St. Claire Republican, St. Claire, Mich., October 26th: "The scheme sounds very plaus- ible."

Lincoln County Times, Davenport, Wash., October 27th: "The effort is well meant."

The Democrat, Pomeroy, Ohio, October 26th: "Mr. Lubin is an extreme protection- ist."

Sentinel-Advertiser, Hopkinton, R. I., Oc- tober 26th: "The idea is founded upon just principles."

Merchants' Review, New York, October 27th: "It's a mighty good scheme for the farmers."

California Demokrat, San Francisco, De- cember 4th and 5th, contains a criticism and review of the proposition, by Mr. D. von Duer- ing, in two parts, each occupying two and a half columns. The following is a quotation: "The farmer is the foundation of the State; if he has nothing, no one has anything. Who can improve the hard times? No one, effectually, except the farmer. To protect him, to assist him, to lighten his burden, should be the aim of all his fellow citizens."

Daily Evening Bulletin, San Francisco, No- vember 14th: "The idea has been indorsed by fruit-growers at Winters and other localities."

The Patrol, Geneva, Ill., October 27th: "We can see many arguments in favor of the first proposition."

The National Economist, Washington D. C., October: "Mr. Lubin has opened a way to a practical settlement of the transportation question."

Republican Free Press, Redding, Cal.: "What he says as regards to why the farmer is not now protected, owing to the fact that Liverpool fixes the price of wheat with the transportation cost deducted, is true."

Freie Presse fur Texas, San Antonio, Octo- ber 26, 1893: "These agitations point out clearly that all should aim and assist in ele- vating the agricultural industry."

Sentinel, Hanford, Cal., October 1st: "Has some good features about it for study."

Staats Zeitung, Little Rock, Ark.: "The plan would be of enormous benefit and is recognized by all."

County Leader, Unionville, Mo., 3d: "This would certainly add to the benefit of agriculture."

Glenny Sentinel, Macclenny, Florida 1st: "It is ultra; but it is not."

Items, Palmyra, Neb., October 1st: "While the farming community now notes of taxation to encourage the growth of industries, they would receive 'quo' in nominal cost of transportation is not so utopian as we are liable to conclude."

Abolition Advocate, Baltimore, Md., 14th: "Is doing a world of good by attention to facts, and causing a dissemination of relief."

aria Times, California, December 1st: "It is high time to do something, and these ideas are certainly in advance of methods."

s Economist, New York, December 1st: "The suggestion is receiving a considerable amount of attention."

stance, Woodland, Cal., September 1st: "The ideas advanced are worthy of consideration."

, San Francisco: "The pamphlet is an interesting work for political economists."

on Tribune, Dixon, Cal., November 1st: "A large and intelligent audience heard the lecture, and remained to the rapt attention."

erald, Auburn, Cal. "The reasons are striking and impressive, but one must read his pamphlets to know they are."

a Fruit-Grower, San Francisco, 25th: "Very many take the ground that government management of all cotton lines, but he advocates nothing else."

Epigram, Baker City, Oregon, October 1st: "His articles give new ideas and will result in great benefit to the community."

outh, Atlanta, Ga., December 2d: "The plan is learnedly of the unjust burden resting upon the agricultural classes."

soner, San Luis Obispo, Nipomo, 30th: "Favorable resolutions were ordered sent to the *Reasoner* for publication."

Kings County News, Hanford, Cal., December 2d: "Has received no small amount of consideration as well as comment."

Poway Progress, Poway, San Diego Co., Cal., December 16th: "It would multiply the demand for our California productions a hundred fold."

The Express, Winters, Yolo Co., Cal., November 18th: "Mr. Lubin spoke about an hour and a half in support of his proposition, elucidating his points in a clear and forcible manner."

Evening Record, San Francisco, November 17th: "The fruit-growers of Winters have indorsed the plan, which has much merit."

The Messenger, South Haven, Mich., November 3d: "The question is, indeed, a novel one."

The Placer Herald, Auburn, Cal. The Novel Proposition explained by the author to an attentive audience in Auburn.

"David Lubin, of Sacramento, as per announcement, addressed the people at the Opera House in Auburn last Wednesday afternoon on his 'Novel Proposition.' He was accompanied by J. M. Higgins and O. C. Danner, on behalf of the Committee on Promulgation from the Federated Trades of Sacramento, and by Mr. Waughtel, of Winters, who represents the farmers of his section. Each of the visiting gentlemen made a short address enthusiastically indorsing Mr. Lubin's proposition. Mr. Norman Logan presided at the meeting, and quite a number of prominent citizens had seats on the platform. The audience was embraced largely of farmers and fruit-growers of this portion of the county, who gave earnest attention to the remarks of the speakers. At the conclusion of Mr. Lubin's address a vote of indorsement of his proposition was carried by a large majority, and a committee, consisting of F. de Gomez, F. M. Varden, and Norman Logan, was appointed to continue the agitation of the proposition in this county."

The Express, Winters, Yolo County, Cal. Nov. 18th. Abstract of report:

"A large concourse of people assembled at the Opera House on Saturday evening of last week to listen to David Lubin of Sacramento in explanation of his 'Novel Proposition.' Mr. Lubin was accompanied by a committee of four gentlemen, officers and members of the Council of Federated Trades of Sacramento, which organization has indorsed Mr. Lubin's plan, and is endeavoring to have similar organizations throughout the State and country do likewise. He was listened to with marked attention throughout his discourse, and there were many nods and expressions of approval when he made a particularly forcible point, or an occasional witty sally. At the conclusion of Mr. Lubin's address, Mr. William Baker, one of Winters' substantial farmers, made a few remarks and introduced the annexed preamble and resolutions, which were unanimously adopted."

d on

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-9201

All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

JUL 07 1997
28D JUL 29 1997

